

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 219--82nd Congress

Chapter 587--1st Session

H. R. 1005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 219	1
Index and Summary of H. R. 1005	1

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 219

BALER TWINE IMPORTS. Amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 1005

January 8, 1951	H. R. 1005 Introduced by Mr. Dingell which was referred to Committee on Ways and Means.
July 16, 1951	Hearings; House, on H. R. 1005
July 26, 1951	Ordered reported
July 27, 1951	Reported with amendment. House Report 771 Print of bill as reported.
July 31, 1951	Approved resolution for consideration
August 2, 1951	Reported resolution for consideration of H. R. 1005.
September 13, 1951	House began debate on H. R. 1005
September 14, 1951	House concluded debate and passed H. R. 1005 as reported.
September 17, 1951	H. R. 1005 referred to Senate Finance Committee
October 19, 1951	Senate reported H. R. 1005 without amendment. Senate Report 1050. Print of bill as reported in the Senate
October 20, 1951	H. R. 1005 passed Senate without amendment
October 25, 1951	Approved: Public Law 219

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1005

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 8, 1951

Mr. DINGELL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

A BILL

To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff
4 Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after
5 the words "binding twine" a comma and the words "and
6 twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder
7 and bedding materials".

82^d CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 1005

A BILL

To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

By Mr. DINGELL

JANUARY 8, 1951

Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

thorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of anthracite in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the anthracite region. Representative Flood, author of the last-mentioned bill, explained the general objectives of the proposal.

MOBILIZATION, MONOPOLY

Committee on the Judiciary: James K. Knudson, Defense Transport Administrator, testified today on the monopoly aspects of the mobilization program before the Celler Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power, which concluded its public hearings on the subject.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Committee on Public Works: Voted (15 to 12) to table H. J. Res. 4, approving U. S.-Canadian agreement relating to the development of resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. This joint resolution, which was introduced by Representative Blatnik, was the last remaining measure on this subject to be referred for committee study and consideration, all other having been tabled at previous meetings.

BALING TWINE—GI ADMISSIONS TAX— CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered the following bills reported favorably to the House—

H. R. 1005, to permit free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials (with two technical amendments); and

H. R. 4601, to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces.

Also announced that public hearings have been scheduled to begin Monday, August 6, on H. R. 1535, making miscellaneous amendments to the Tariff Act of 1930, and certain related acts, for the most part liberalizing or

relaxing certain import provisions. This legislation will be known as Customs Simplification Act of 1951.

Joint Committee Meetings

DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Conferees continued, in executive session, on S. 1717, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950, reaching the following agreements: Continuing on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the portion of the bill on amendments to the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 (rent control), the House conferees accepted the Senate-passed provision providing that the President would fix rents in critical defense housing areas, using base period of May-June 1950; House conferees receded from House amendment which would have allowed local bodies to prevent imposition of rent controls in places declared to be critical defense housing areas by the Secretary of Defense and by Director of Defense Mobilization; and the House conferees also accepted the Senate amendment which prohibits imposition of Federal rent controls in States or local governments having local rent control as long as rents in such areas do not increase faster than the national average increase. Conferees meet in night session (7:30) to continue their work.

APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR

Conferees on H. R. 3790, Interior appropriations for 1952, met again in executive session to continue working out differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the bill. They did not conclude, and will meet again tomorrow.

FUR LABELING

Conferees on H. R. 2321, to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs, agreed to file conference report on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the bill.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 27

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions, 10:30 a. m., room F-39, Capitol; Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, executive, 10 a. m., room F-82, Capitol.

Committee on Finance, on H. R. 4473, tax revision, 10 a. m., 312 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, on S. 1762, mutual security, with Secretary Marshall, 10:30 a. m., 318 Senate Office Building.

Select Committee on Small Business, subcommittee, on S. 719, price discrimination and basing point, 10 a. m., 457 Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Agriculture, on H. R. 4521, extending the Sugar Act of 1948 until December 31, 1956, 10 a. m., 1310 New House Office Building. Witnesses will be Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Branch, Department of Agriculture; and Gordon Peyton, representing certain manufacturers.

Committee on Armed Services, Kilday Subcommittee No. 2 on H. R. 3366, to amend Career Compensation Act regarding bonus payments for certain enlistments, and other bills, 10 a. m., 313-A Old House Office Building.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Holifield special subcommittee on Home Loan Bank Board, administration and related matters, 10 a. m., 429 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, on Mutual Security Program, room G-3, Capitol. Executive session (10 a. m.) to hear Richard Bissell, Deputy Administrator, ECA; John H. Ohly, Acting Assistant Director, Office of International Security Affairs; Brig. Gen. George H. Olmsted, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, Department of the Army. Executive session (2:30 p. m.) to hear Ambassador Charles M. Spofford, U. S. Deputy to North Atlantic Council (NATO operations in Europe); Gen. A. Franklin Kibler, Director, Joint American Military Advisory Group; Ambassador Milton Katz, ECA special representative for Europe (Economic operations in Europe); and William L. Batt, U. S. Member, Defense Production Board (European production).

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Bentsen Subcommittee on Public Lands to consider H. R. 1638, to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system; and H. R. 3937 and 3938, similar bills, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to administer, operate, maintain, etc., until such time as established, the properties acquired for the establishment of the In-

dependence National Historical Park, 10 a. m., 1324 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Beckworth Special Subcommittee on Newsprint in open hearings, 10 a. m., 1334 New House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Bryson Subcommittee No. 3 on H. R. 4915, to amend title 18 of the U. S. Code, relating to sabotage, executive, 10 a. m., 345 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, executive consideration of Federal pay increase legislation, 10 a. m., 213 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Ways and Means, Forand Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance, on H. R. 3393, to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees, executive, 10 a. m., 1102 New House Office Building.

Joint Committee

Conferees, executive, on H. R. 3790, Interior appropriations, 10 a. m., room F-37, Capitol.

PROVIDING FOR THE FREE IMPORTATION OF BALER TWINE

JULY 27, 1951.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. DOUGHTON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted
the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 1005]

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1005), having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

In line 7, insert a comma immediately before the quotation mark.

After line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PURPOSE

This bill would provide for the entry, free of duty, of twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials, which is commonly referred to as baler twine. This would be accomplished by amending paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which paragraph now provides for the entry, free of duty, of binder twine. Under the existing provisions of paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1930, binding twine is admitted free of duty if—manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding 750 feet to the pound.

Under the bill, these restrictions will apply not only to binder twine, but also to baler twine which is chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Baler twine is now subject to duty at 15 percent ad valorem. It is used principally in automatic pick-up hay balers to tie and bind bales of hay, straw, and fodder crops. It first came into use in 1939, and its use has increased materially since that time due to the steadily increasing use of automatic pick-up twine balers by farmers who find that such baling is efficient and economical. Binder twine, which is also an agricultural twine, and which is used primarily for binding sheaves of grain and corn, and in some cases hay, has been duty-free since 1896. In many other instances, Congress has exempted from duty commodities and implements used in agricultural pursuits.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals held in the case of *Wilbur-Ellis Co. v. United States* (26 C. C. P. A. 402 (1939)), that the baling of hay is an agricultural pursuit. That case involved the question of the entry of wire-baling ties which were held entitled to entry free of duty under paragraph 1604 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as agricultural implements. Yet, by a ruling of the Commissioner of Customs, on October 15, 1945, holding that baler twine falls within paragraph 1005 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, baler twine used for the same purposes as baling wire is now dutiable at 15 percent ad valorem. This decision of the Commissioner of Customs is still in the process of litigation.

Your committee believes that there is no just basis for distinguishing between the tariff status of such essential commodities of similar use on the farm as binder twine, baling wire, and baler twine. This bill will place baler twine on the same duty-free status as binder twine and baling wire, which is in accord with the established policy of Congress to admit agricultural commodities and implements free of duty.

Witnesses representing farmers and farm organizations appeared before your committee and testified that there is an acute shortage of baler twine. Many reports have been received that, even at the high prices for which baler twine is now selling, it is impossible to obtain sufficient supplies of this twine, which has resulted in losses of hay crops. The representatives of the farm organizations testified that a growing number of farmers are demonstrating a preference for baler twine over baling wire both from the standpoint of greater safety to livestock and greater economy of operation of balers using twine over balers using wire. Although domestic manufacturers of baler twine testified that production in the current year is at a higher rate than in the previous year, they agreed that in many areas of the country farmers have been unable to obtain baler twine in sufficient quantity to meet their needs.

Testimony presented before your committee was in general agreement that imports of baler twine would be increased by providing for duty-free entry. There is no reason to believe that the American farmer would not insist upon as high a standard of quality in the baler twine imported free of duty as he insists upon today in baler twine subject to duty and baler twine produced by domestic manufacturers.

Yet the benefit to the American farmer accorded by this bill, in the judgment of your committee, will result in no substantial adverse effect upon the domestic producers of baler twine. The record of the

hearings before your committee affords no basis for concluding that the elimination of the present duty would prevent domestic manufacturers from selling their production of baler twine at a reasonable price.

Nor would there be any adverse effect upon the national security of the United States from the removal of the present tariff on baler twine. Arguments were presented that the stockpiling objectives of the Munitions Board might be endangered on the ground that there would not be a domestic industry large enough to handle the rotation of the fibers if imports of baler twine were allowed to come in duty-free. It is understood, however, that foreign producers of baler twine have already been asked to share in the rotation of the stockpile maintained in this country.

Accordingly, there seems to be no sound reason for denying the plea of the four major American farm organizations to relieve the American farmer from the penalty of the tariff on baler twine under existing law through passage of H. R. 1005. In their joint testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, the representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Farmers Union, and the National Grange urged that passage of the bill is in the public interest for the following reasons:

First, to carry out a long-established tariff policy of Congress to admit free binding twine.

Second, to increase the supply of baler twine available in this country.

Third, to bring about a more reasonable price.

Fourth, to provide healthy competition in which, we firmly believe, the domestic producer will continue to retain the bulk of a rapidly expanding market.

Fifth, to protect the American food supply.

A favorable report on the bill was received from the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget reported that the bill is in accord with the program of the President.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as introduced, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

PARAGRAPH 1622 OF SECTION 201 OF TITLE II OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930, AS AMENDED

PAR. 1622. All binding **[twine manufactured]** *twine, and twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding seven hundred and fifty feet to the pound.*

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 1005

H. R. 1005 is permanent legislation involving in long-range effect our national security, the welfare of our domestic cordage industry, and the American farmer. In our opinion the result of enactment of H. R. 1005 will be injurious to all three.

The alleged purpose of H. R. 1005 is to cure an emergency shortage of baler twine used by our farmers, principally in the automatic pick-up hay baler to tie and bind the compressed bales of hay and fodder. The present shortage, like other shortages, has arisen as the result of post-Korea excessive buying—unfortunately encouraged by responsible farm publications.

There is a close balance between supply and demand of fibers from which baling twine is made. This is evidenced by its practically doubling in price during the last few months on the world market. All such fiber is produced outside the United States, and our manufacturers must purchase it in competition with foreign manufacturers.

That our manufacturers were not remiss in their efforts to assure an adequate domestic supply is clear from the fact that in the current year they have supplied our domestic distributors with 110,529,000 pounds as contrasted with 67,245,000 pounds—a normal supply—last year. Furthermore, the fairness of the manufacturers' price is evident from the fact that while the fiber cost advanced 15 cents per pound, their twine prices have been advanced only 9.7 cents per pound. The current price of Canadian binder twine, in American dollars, is slightly higher.

Thus, the present shortage experienced by some farmers, and the prices which may have been paid by them at retail, are in no way attributable to our manufacturers, nor will H. R. 1005 relieve the present situation. Irrespective of whether H. R. 1005 is enacted, the world supply and price of fiber will basically affect our domestic situation, and it appears likely that both supply and price will shortly be much more favorable.

From testimony presented during the public hearings we believe that the present shortage of baler twine will shortly be eliminated by increased production which is now under way. We believe also that the present emergency shortage could be immediately cured through aggressive action by the Department of Agriculture in utilizing its vast information channels to discourage hoarding and to encourage farmers who have more than adequate supplies of twine to release this twine for use by other farmers.

But instead of meeting this emergency problem through emergency action the committee has been fit to report H. R. 1005 which will permanently eliminate the 15 percent ad valorem duty on imported baler twine by placing it on the free list. In our opinion if the elimination of the present shortage of baler twine were the true paramount motive of this bill, then surely a temporary suspension of the duty on baler twine for a period of approximately 15 months and not a

permanent freezing of baler twine on the free list would have been provided.

Another serious objection to H. R. 1005 is that it is utterly without protection to the farmer as to the length per pound or the quality of his baling twine, nor has it protection of the American manufacturer who supplies our farmers against inferior baling twine of foreign manufacturers, who will eventually capture the market if H. R. 1005 is adopted.

Our farmers are accustomed to 225 feet per pound of baling twine, with ample strength to hold 80-pound bales. It has rat-insect-, and mildew-proofing and oil content which insures that the farmer will not store bales of hay only to find broken bales of loose hay later on.

Furthermore, the proposed legislation does not confine itself to the objective of importing, duty-free, baling twine suitable for our baling machines. Instead, it not only lacks quality and length safeguards, but applies to any cordage product coming within the vague purview of "twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials." How far this would permit the destruction of the American cordage industry in the field of commercial as well as agricultural twine can be known only after extensive litigation.

In our opinion the inevitable result of permanently transferring baler twine to the free list will be to destroy domestic production of baler twine and thus put the American farmer at the mercy of foreign producers and imports. There will be little, if any, financial saving to our farmer in the cost of baler twine and in fact, once the American industry has been destroyed, the price of the imported baler twine will rise rapidly. This has historically been true of articles placed permanently on the free list.

The baler-twine industry, although relatively small in size, ranks among the foremost strategic industries necessary for the prosecution of war, and enactment of H. R. 1005 will have effects which might seriously interfere with the Government's stockpiling program. Manila and sisal fibers have been designated by the Munitions Board among group A stockpiling materials. Fibers in the stockpile cannot be kept permanently, but must be rotated—that is, new fibers added and older fibers sold to our manufacturers.

With the loss of our markets to foreign producers, productive facilities in this country will dry up and, consequently, will not be available to rotate the stockpiled fiber in peacetime nor to convert it into finished products during war. A stockpile of fibers would be meaningless under these circumstances.

We call the attention of the Congress to the following letter dated June 6, 1951 from the Munitions Board opposing this legislation from the standpoint of national defense:

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1951.

HON. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REED: This will acknowledge your letter of May 29 regarding baler twine and the proposal to remove the tariff thereon.

American manufacturers have learned from experience that a very large proportion of sisal, which is considerably more expensive than henequen, is necessary for making baler twine of required strength. Sisal also has displaced abacá to some extent in baler twine in recent years. The importance of baler

twine and the increased proportion of sisal therein are indicated by the following statistics:

Baler twine sales

[Fiber content in millions of pounds]

	Hene- quen	Sisal	Abacá	Hemp	Total
1946.....	18.8	13.1	-----	5.6	37.5
1947 (controls terminated July 15, 1947).....	25.6	24.6	10.0	8.7	68.9
1948.....	19.2	27.1	6.4	-----	52.7
1949.....	9.4	34.4	2.5	-----	46.3
1950 (estimated).....	11.4	56.5	4.3	-----	72.2

Sisal and abacá are being stockpiled by the United States, whereas henequen, which is used chiefly for binder twine, is not. The need for rotating the stockpile of sisal every few years makes the mill facilities for consuming rotated fiber extremely important in permitting a more adequate stockpile. Conversely, insufficient facilities for consuming sisal would reduce the maximum size of the stockpile that could be maintained and rotated in this country. From the standpoint of national defense this seems to be more important than a minor and probably temporary reduction in the price of baler twine. Maintenance of domestic manufacturing facilities is essential for any emergency, because in time of war there generally is a threefold increase in the requirements for rope and twine in agriculture, mining, shipping, and for military use. Therefore, the Munitions Board is opposed to the elimination of the remaining small duty on baler twine.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. MIDDLETON,
Vice Chairman for Production and Requirements.

We cannot believe that the proponents of this legislation desire that the American cordage industry, manufacturers and employees, be destroyed; that our farmers be placed at the mercy of foreign imports; and that an important part of our future security program be seriously disturbed. These are considerations of much more moment than such temporary advantage, if any, as might result from enactment of H. R. 1005. At least equal temporary benefits without these grave long-range consequences could be obtained by appropriate emergency legislation. For these reasons we are opposed to H. R. 1005.

DANIEL A. REED.
ROY O. WOODRUFF.
THOMAS A. JENKINS.
RICHARD M. SIMPSON.
ROBERT W. KEAN.
NOAH M. MASON.

We believe that H. R. 1005 could be improved by providing an adequate definition of baler twine in order to assure that our farmers will be protected from imports of inferior grade baling twine.

THOMAS E. MARTIN.
JOHN W. BYRNES.



82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1005

[Report No. 771]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 8, 1951

Mr. DINGELL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

JULY 27, 1951

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff
4 Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after
5 the words "binding twine" a comma and the words "and
6 twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder
7 and bedding ~~materials~~". *materials*".

8 *SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effec-*
9 *tive with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from ware-*
10 *house, for consumption after the date of the enactment of*
11 *this Act.*

82ND CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1005

[Report No. 771]

A BILL

To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

By Mr. DINGELL

JANUARY 8, 1951

Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

JULY 27, 1951

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$50,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....0
 Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1951 to June 30, 1951.....5,837.65
 Balance unexpended.....44,162.35

R. L. DOUGHTON,
 Chairman.

JULY 15, 1951.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD PRODUCTS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1951, to June 30, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Vineent A. Kleinfeld	Chief counsel	\$3,003.41
Alvin L. Gottlieb	Associate counsel	481.03
Camille O'Reilly Agnew	Clerk	1,326.84
Esther N. Schweigert	Secretary	864.41
Franklin O. Bing	Technical consultant, WAE	150.63
Lester Uretz	Associate counsel (2 days in January)	50.28
Lois Fisher	Stenographer (7 days in May)	84.13
Total		5,900.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$75,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....None
 Amount expended.....None

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1951.....7,234.37
 Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1951.....67,765.63

JAMES J. DELANEY,
 Chairman.

JULY 9, 1951.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EDUCATIONAL, TRAINING, AND LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAMS UNDER THE GI BILL

(H. Res. 474, 81st Cong., and H. Res. 93, 82d Cong.)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George W. Fisher	Chief clerk	\$1,919.86
Josephine Frick	Stenographer	2,087.01
James E. Flannery	Research analyst	2,786.86
Arthur Perlman	Investigator	1,544.24
George M. Rose	Staff member	3,511.07
Irene Wade	Stenographer	2,504.42
Bill J. Williams	Investigator	2,956.05
Harry Hagoney	do	2,650.27
Richard V. Kelly	do	2,128.56
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.	General counsel	2,229.12
Oliver E. Meadows	Chief clerk	1,878.15
Walton Woods	Investigator	751.25
Helen A. Wright	Stenographer	759.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$90,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....14,360.48
 Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1951.....42,556.84

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1951.....42,556.84
 Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1951.....133,082.63

¹ Of which \$8,815.54 is unexpended funds from H. Res. 474; balance unexpended from H. Res. 93, \$24,267.14.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
 Chairman.

JULY 9, 1951.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAM UNDER GI BILL

(H. Res. 474, 81st Cong.)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the period from January 1, 1951, to January 3, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during period
George W. Fisher	Chief clerk	\$62.60
Josephine Frick	Stenographer	41.73
James E. Flannery	Research analyst	46.44
Arthur Perlman	Investigator	62.60
George M. Rose	Staff member	58.51
Irene Wade	Stenographer	41.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$30,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....14,360.48
 Amount expended from Jan. 1 to Jan. 3, 1951.....6,823.98

Total amount expended from Sept. 22, 1950, to Jan. 3, 1951.....21,184.46
 Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1951.....8,815.54

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
 Chairman.

JULY 9, 1951.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EDUCATIONAL, TRAINING, AND LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAMS UNDER THE GI BILL

(H. Res. 93, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1951, to June 30, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George W. Fisher	Chief clerk	\$1,857.26
James E. Flannery	Research analyst	2,740.42
Josephine Frick	Stenographer	2,045.28
Arthur Perlman	Investigator	1,481.64
George M. Rose	Staff member	3,452.56
Irene Wade	Stenographer	2,462.69
Bill J. Williams	Investigator	2,956.05
Harry Hagoney	do	2,650.27
Richard V. Kelly	do	2,128.56
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.	General counsel	2,229.12
Oliver E. Meadows	Chief clerk	1,878.15
Walton Woods	Investigator	751.25
Helen A. Wright	Stenographer	759.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$60,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....None
 Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1951.....35,732.86

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1951.....35,732.86
 Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1951.....24,267.14

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
 Chairman.

JULY 16, 1951.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4, 1951, to June 30, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Duncan Clark	Research analyst	\$3,795.65
Jean C. Curtis	Clerk	2,462.83
Victor P. Dalmas	Executive director	5,332.59
Jane M. Deem	Secretary	1,762.88
Mildred Deen	Stenographer	413.97
Clarence D. Everett	Investigator	3,218.49
Richard R. Haas	Research assistant	71.19
Rowan F. Howard	Special investigator	399.30
Louise Kauffman	Stenographer	1,070.35
Arthur F. Lucas	Economist	1,360.62
Laverne Maynard	Stenographer	2,393.28
Bertha A. Padgett	Clerk	91.68
Jeremiah T. Riley	Investigator	1,151.58
Mary Shaw	Stenographer	1,070.35
Mary Nell Snow	Typist	98.88
M. Elizabeth Soper	Stenographer	2,035.43
Ernest L. Stockton	Research analyst	4,475.38
Harriet B. Whitney	Stenographer	1,385.16
Wanita Wilson	do	1,644.43
Total		34,234.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$100,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....None
 Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1951.....50,368.15

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1951.....49,631.85

WRIGHT PATMAN,
 Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

649. A letter from the Assistant to the Military Director for Supply Management, Munitions Board, transmitting the Second Joint Report on the Federal Catalog Program, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 97 (81st Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

650. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$950,000 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 207); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

651. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$6,500,000 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 208); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

652. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for dis-

posal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITAKER: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1246. An Act to amend certain laws relating to the submission of postmasters' accounts under oath, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee of Conference. H. R. 2321. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs (Rept. No. 769). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of Conference. S. 1717. An act to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended (Rept. No. 770). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1005. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for bailing hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; with amendment (Rept. No. 771). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 4973. A bill to provide that no furniture, equipment, or supplies shall be furnished to any Member of Congress except upon his specific written request; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4974. A bill to provide for the addition of certain Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS (by request):

H. R. 4975. A bill to continue service-connected tubercular total disability ratings of certain veterans in certain instances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SITTLER:

H. R. 4976. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4977. A bill to amend 338 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4978. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Food and Drug district office at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 4979. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4980. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4981. A bill to provide a cost-of-living pay increase for officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution requiring the Atomic Energy Commission to submit a plan to the Congress providing for the establishment of local self-government for the city of Richland, Hanford Works, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to require that all Government publications be inscribed with the motto "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. RABAUT: Memorial of Michigan State Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into legislation H. R. 4526, or similar legislation, providing readjustment allowances for certain unemployed former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4982. A bill for the relief of Joseph Miele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 4983. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Ethridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 4984. A bill for the relief of Jean M. Christens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4985. A bill for the relief of Soichiro Inouye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 4986. A bill to authorize the appointment of Dante Vezzoli as an officer in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4987. A bill for the relief of James L. Curry and Phoebe Curry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4988. A bill for the relief of Noriko Okazaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4989. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Nakai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 4990. A bill for the relief of Altoon Saprighian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 4991. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Almira Gilbreath Ramser; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4992. A bill for the relief of Yoko Todoroki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 4993. A bill for the relief of Clint Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

367. Mr. HORAN presented a petition of Okanogan Union of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Okanogan, Wash., relative to supporting legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.



3298, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, dealing with the refilling of prescriptions for certain drugs, after which the Committee debated the bill for 20 minutes before deferring further action until Wednesday.

Pages 9444-9450

Program for Wednesday: Adjourned at 5:06 p. m. until Wednesday, August 1, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will continue consideration of H. R. 3298, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, dealing with the refilling of prescriptions for certain drugs, and act on conference report on H. R. 4329, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1952. The House may also act on H. Res. 323, to amend H. Res. 51, relating to the authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate jurisdictional matters.

Committee Meetings

SUGAR ACT EXTENSION

Committee on Agriculture: Concluded public hearings on H. R. 4521, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948. The extension period would run from December 31, 1952, to December 31, 1956. Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Branch, PMA, Department of Agriculture, appeared for further testimony, this time to offer rebuttal to the testimony of the representatives of the American Molasses Co., particularly regarding soluble nonsugar solids. Resident Commissioner Fernós-Isern of Puerto Rico testified in support of the proposed legislation and presented a background of present economic and social conditions in Puerto Rico so vitally affected by the act. This bill would increase Puerto Rico's quota for marketing on the mainland from 910,000 tons to 1,080,000 tons. Committee recessed until tomorrow morning, when it will hold executive meeting on the measure.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Committee on Armed Services: Brooks Special Subcommittee on Civilian Components continued public hearings on H. R. 4860, the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951. The following witnesses testified at today's session: Edwin H. Burgess, former Chairman of the Civilian Components Policy Board, Department of Defense, and Brig. Gen. Melvin Maas, head of Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association. General Maas did not complete his testimony and will resume at the meeting scheduled for tomorrow morning.

FLOOD DISASTER—COINAGE—DEFENSE HOUSING

Committee on Banking and Currency: Ordered the following bills reported to the House:

H. J. Res. 303, to provide housing relief in the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma flood disaster emergency; and H. R. 3176, authorizing the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the lives and perpetuate the ideals and

teachings of Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver.

Also considered amendments to the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951. Made no announcement as to what action was taken, and will resume in another executive session tomorrow morning.

D. C. HOLIDAY PAY—VIRGINIA BRIDGE

Committee on the District of Columbia: Davis Subcommittee on Public Service, Streets, and Traffic approved for reporting to the full committee H. R. 4859, granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, Fire Department, White House and U. S. Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays. Also considered, but took no action on, H. R. 2954, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Shepherds Landing.

Officials of the uniformed departments testified in favor of the holiday pay bill, while witnesses heard on the Potomac River bridge bill were District Engineer Commissioner Bernard L. Robinson; C. S. Mullen, chief engineer of the Virginia State Highway Department; Burton Marye, assistant to Mr. Mullen; and C. L. Watkins, director of public works in Alexandria, Va. Also heard on the proposed bridge were John Nolen, Planning Director of the National Park and Planning Commission; and H. E. Hilts, Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, which Bureau is to make a study on the question of priorities. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

TERRITORIAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Committee on Education and Labor: Held public hearings on H. R. 1732, a bill which would put Alaska and Hawaii on the same basis as the States in the apportionment of funds for the school-lunch program. Delegate Farrington of Hawaii (author of the measure), Delegate Bartlett of Alaska, and Resident Commissioner Fernós-Isern of Puerto Rico were all heard in support of the legislation. Officials of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture were also present. An amendment was suggested by the Department of Agriculture which would insure Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to receive equal funds in this school-lunch program as presently received by the lowest-income State. Recessed until Friday morning.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Continued its series of meetings on the proposed Mutual Security Program, which requests authorization for appropriation of \$8.5 billion—\$6.3 billion for military aid, \$2.2 billion for economic aid. Lt. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, Chief of Staff, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers, Europe, met with the committee in morning and afternoon executive sessions.

Adjourned until tomorrow morning for further consideration of the Mutual Security Program in an executive meeting.

INDIANS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Morris Subcommittee on Indian Affairs approved for reporting to the full committee S. 950, relative to extending time in which payments are to be made to members of tribes from trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation; and H. R. 4219, amended, H. R. 4351, and H. R. 4352, three private patent-in-fee bills; and tabled H. R. 4636, a companion bill to S. 950.

Also considered, but took no final action on, H. R. 460, to provide for Government guaranty of loans made to Indians for the purchase or improvement of farms and farming equipment under the supervision of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Representative D'Ewart, author of the bill, spoke on its behalf. He was also heard in favor of the three approved patent-in-fee bills. Two officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs spoke in opposition to the bill. They were Lewis A. Sigler in the Office of the Solicitor, and Albert Huber. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

BASEBALL, MONOPOLY

Committee on the Judiciary: Ford C. Frick, president of the National League, concluded his testimony before the Celler Subcommittee on Monopoly Power, which is conducting hearings regarding organized baseball. Mr. Frick spoke in support of organized baseball's position on its reserve clause and stressed the need of its continuation. He also said that the game is of great importance to the American people—"a game typically American in its concept and a part of American life." He concluded by saying that he was assured that millions of American baseball fans join with him in the belief that the game should continue as it is.

SHIPPING COLLISIONS

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Subcommittee on Maritime Affairs approved for reporting to the full committee, with amendments, H. R. 3670, to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

FEDERAL PAY INCREASE

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Resumed executive consideration of Federal pay increase legislation and agreed to pay raises for postal employees as follows: Beginning July 1, 1951, a \$400 flat increase in salary to all postal employees paid on an annual basis, except fourth-class postmasters, who will receive a 20-percent increase. Hourly employees will receive a 20-cent-an-hour increase. An additional increase in the entrance salary for postal employees was provided through the elimination of the first three postal salary

grades. Another provision gives one or two grade increases to those postal employees who entered the service after July 1, 1945, and who have not received at least two grade increases by operation of law. Committee recessed until tomorrow morning for further executive consideration of the legislation.

FLOOD DISASTER

Committee on Public Works: Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, furnished a report on damages caused by the recent flood in the States comprising the Missouri Basin. He also presented exhibits showing where dams presently under construction but not completed may have prevented some of the damage. He stated that the total destruction caused by the flood was approximately \$1 billion.

SOVIET EXPORTS BAN—BALING TWINE

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule providing for 1 hour's debate on H. R. 4550, to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and an open rule providing for 2 hours' general debate on H. R. 1005, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the duty-free importation of twine for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials.

Representative Battle, author of the Soviet shipping bill, appeared on behalf of the rule. Representatives Doughton, Cooper, and Reed of New York were heard on the request of a rule on the baling-twine bill. Representative Reed, while he offered no objection to granting the rule, stated he was in opposition to the proposed legislation.

PROPERTY TAX—LEAD—LIQUOR TAX

Committee on Ways and Means: Met for executive consideration of H. R. 3590, relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property; H. R. 4948, to suspend certain import duties on lead; and H. R. 2745, to amend Internal Revenue Code (sec. 2801) regarding tax exemptions on cordials and liqueurs. Took no final action and adjourned until tomorrow morning when it will continue on same legislation.

Joint Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of H. R. 4329, D. C. appropriations for 1952.

The appropriations agreed upon by the conferees would total \$138,216,150. It was also agreed by the conferees that Federal contributions toward D. C. expenses in the general fund would total \$10.4 million.

Senate

THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. J. Arthur Rinkel, minister, Central Methodist Church, Winona, Minn., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, father of all mankind, deepen our sense of relationship and accountability to Thee. Instill in our hearts a great love of truth, and enlighten our minds that we may comprehend the truth. Give us a longing for righteousness, believing that "Righteousness exalteth a nation." Save us from the follies we see in others and direct us in the path of wisdom.

Bless, O God, all who guide the destiny of mankind in this trying hour, and may it please Thee to use our President, and all in authority with him, to lead our Nation and our world to peace in our time.

"Save us from weak resignation
To the evils we deplore.

* * * *

Set our feet on lofty places,
Gird our lives that they may be
Garnered with all Christlike graces,
In our fight to make men free.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee!"

In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 1, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 1, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 263. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended; and

S. 673. An act to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KEFAUVER, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, sitting in joint session, were au-

thorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 198)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twelfth report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (Title I of Public Law 472), as amended, as well as the programs of economic aid in the general area of China under the China Area Aid Act (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong.), and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 430, 447, and 535, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended March 31, 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 2, 1951.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5136, REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO UNDERWRITING OF CERTAIN SECURITIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to underwriting and dealing in securities issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

APPOINTMENT AND EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired offi-

cers without affecting their retired status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESOLUTIONS OF MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at the Missouri River States committee meeting.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, gave an excellent report on the devastation and destruction which have occurred in the Missouri and Arkansas River basins during recent floods.

The resolutions were adopted at a meeting of 2,000 residents from the States in the affected areas.

The economic loss of more than \$1,000,000,000 has vividly portrayed the damage that has occurred during the past few weeks in this area and must not be allowed to occur again.

These floods can be controlled, and proposals now before Congress must be commenced at the earliest possible date.

I wish to personally express my appreciation for the splendid support that we in the flood area have received from the Members of Congress and our citizens generally. While the destruction has been great, and the rehabilitation program will no doubt be slow, the spirit of our citizens is undaunted.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE MEETING

Whereas no nation in the world is rich enough to afford the flood loss in human life and property just suffered on the rivers of Kansas and Missouri; and

Whereas we, the residents of the Missouri and the Arkansas River Basins, assembled here in Kansas City, Mo., this 25th day of July 1951, firmly believe that the tragedy of the floods of 1951 must never be repeated; Now, therefore, in order to prevent a recurrence of the flood catastrophe, be it

Resolved, That the people of the Missouri and Arkansas River Basins demand Federal appropriations to carry out the orderly and prompt completion of the authorized Pick-Sloan plan of flood control. It is further recommended that immediate appropriations should include funds sufficient to (1) start construction of the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, (2) start construction on Gavins Point Dam, (3) assure the continuance of work on the Oahe Dam and all other dams now under construction, (4) insure immediate inauguration of work on dams not under construction, which include important flood-control features; it is further

Resolved, That adequate funds immediately should be made available to the Corps

and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 366. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1005, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; without amendment (Rept. No. 786). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3436. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; with amendment (Rept. No. 787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LARCADE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3209. A bill amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARY: Committee of conference. H. R. 3282. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 789). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5037. A bill to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 5038. A bill to provide certain educational and training benefits to veterans who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5039. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 5040. A bill to provide certain edu-

cational and training benefits to veterans who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5041. A bill to prevent the taking of bail which originates with subversive individuals or organizations in criminal cases, and to prohibit bail, pending appeal or certiorari, after conviction of certain offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 5042. A bill to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

H. R. 5043. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 5044. A bill to transfer the Employment Service administration of the various States to the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5045. A bill to amend section 10 (e), subdivision (b), item (4), of the Administrative Procedure Act, Public Law 404, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 5046. A bill to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5047. A bill to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5048. A bill relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 5049. A bill to amend section 601 of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning August 19, 1951,

as National Clay Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to enter into agreements prior to construction to purchase mortgages on housing in disaster areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5050. A bill for the relief of Stephen J. Gromczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5051. A bill for the relief of Piotr Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 5052. A bill for the relief of Cyril Claude Andersen, Patricia Andersen Hill, and Thelma Andersen McNeill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 5053. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

372. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Maine Federation of Women's Clubs, urging the leaders of both major political parties and Representatives in Congress to lay aside personal and partisan considerations and let their criticisms and actions be solely in the national interest and be tempered with wisdom and judgment; and urging upon its Members the need for examining and evaluating all factors in a given situation before coming to conclusions and giving voice thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

373. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Milton Grange, No. 670, Milton Junction, Wis., gravely concerned about the reduced value of the American dollar and the instability of our economy which may result if the inflationary trend continues; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

California. My interest is in having San Diego and the other west-coast cities in southern California get their legal quotas with top priority and not bottom priority. Certainly I want San Diego to have her 112,000 acre-feet annually, half of which will be carried by this second barrel of the adqueduct, but I want it to be as a part of the total California legal allotment and not in addition thereto.

ARMED SERVICES NURSING BILL

(Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have just finished the hearings on a nursing bill that I introduced last January, H. R. 910.

In view of the fact that \$61,000,000,000 has been appropriated for military purposes presupposes an emergency, recently we appropriated for an additional 120,000 hospital beds. I am wondering who is going to take care of the patients in those beds, for the nurse shortage is very real and grows more and more acute. H. R. 910 is the result of several years of study and many months of hard work. It has in it definite safeguards against Federal control and puts the ultimate control into the hands of this Congress where it belongs. It is the Congress that will decide the continuance or discontinuance of the program at any time it sees fit.

I have asked for this moment in order to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, my fellow Ohioan and Clevelander, the distinguished Mr. CROSSER, and to the members of the committee, and thank them for the consideration given to the witnesses and to myself in the entire matter. I hope very earnestly that the committee will meet shortly and bring the bill to the floor.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FREE IMPORTATION OF BALER TWINE

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 366 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 170]

Abernethy	Fine	Mansfield
Adair	Fisher	Martin, Iowa
Allen, Calif.	Fogarty	Meador
Allen, La.	Frazier	Morrow
Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Miller, Calif.
Andresen,	Garmatz	Mitchell
August H.	Gavin	Morano
Angell	Gore	Morgan
Armstrong	Granahan	Morrison
Bakewell	Granger	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett	Green	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Ky.	Gwinn	O'Konski
Bentsen	Hagen	Ostertag
Bishop	Hall,	Patman
Blackney	Leonard W.	Phillbin
Boggs, La.	Harden	Potter
Bosone	Hart	Powell
Boykin	Harvey	Quinn
Breen	Havener	Rabaut
Brooks	Kébert	Rains
Brownson	Hedrick	Reams
Buckley	Heffernan	Redden
Busbey	Heller	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Hill	Rhodes
Canfield	Hillings	Richards
Carlyle	Hinshaw	Rivers
Carnahan	Hoeven	Roosevelt
Case	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadlak
Celler	Holifield	St. George
Chatham	Holmes	Scott, Hardie
Clemente	Horan	Scott,
Clevenger	Howell	Hugh, D., Jr.
Cole, N. Y.	Hunter	Secrest
Colmer	Irving	Shafer
Combs	Jackson, Calif.	Sheehan
Cooley	Jackson, Wash.	Shelley
Corbett	Jenison	Sheppard
Cotton	Johnson	Short
Coudert	Jonas	Sikes
Crawford	Jones, Mo.	Sittler
Curtis, Nebr.	Jones,	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Hamilton, C.	Stefan
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Stigler
Dawson	Kee	Stockman
Deane	Kelly, N. Y.	Tackett
DeGraffenried	Kennedy	Talle
Dempsey	Kerr	Taylor
Denton	Kersten, Wis.	Teague
Dollinger	Kilburn	Thomas
Dolliver	Klein	Thornberry
Donohue	Lane	Vall
Donovan	Latham	Weichel
Dorn	Lecompte	Wigglesworth
Doyle	Lesinski	Wilson, Ind.
Durham	Lind	Wilson, Tex.
Eaton	Lucas	Withrow
Ellsworth	McCarthy	Wolverton
Elston	McCormack	Wood, Ga.
Engle	McCulloch	Wood, Idaho
Evins	McGrath	Yates
Fenton	Mack, Ill.	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and forty-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY, FLOOD, PRESTON, MARSHALL, CANNON, STEFAN, CLEVINGER, and TABER.

FREE IMPORTATION OF BALER TWINE

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time, 30 minutes, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill (H. R. 1005) which amends the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material. The twine is now subject to a duty of 15 percent. Binder twine, which is almost the same thing, used for binding shocks of grain, has been on the duty-free list since 1896.

This resolution provides for 2 hours of general debate under an open rule. There are minority views, and I believe and amendment will be offered to make this temporary instead of permanent legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule on this side of the aisle, although I do understand there is some objection to the bill itself and that some amendments will be offered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the speech of Candidate Truman dedicating the GAO Building in which he told the people that from 1947 through 1951, over the last 5 years, we have operated the Government with a surplus of nearly \$8,000,000,000, follows the same line of reckless statements used in the 1948 campaign.

In this same speech the President charged his critics with peddling "butterfly statistics" and "a pack of lies" about his conduct of Federal finances. He said the eight billion surplus he referred to was proof that he believed in operating the Government's finances on a sound basis. Let us see who is dealing in butterfly statistics, or worse.

The President, you will recall, based his campaign for reelection in 1948 largely in opposition to the record of the Eightieth Republican Congress during the years 1947 and 1948. The statistics his pencil men developed to enable the President to make his statement of an eight billion surplus over the past 5 years

had to begin with the year 1947 when the Republican Eightieth Congress cut the President's budget, over his opposition, which showed a surplus of \$754,000,000. His figures also included the year 1948 when the Republican Congress again cut his budget, with the result that it left a surplus of \$8,419,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, these figures show that the economy-minded Republican Eightieth Congress which Truman in his campaign said was the worst, or next worst, in history, balanced the budget for the first time in 16 years, reduced taxes by \$4,800,000,000, and showed a surplus for the two years, 1947 and 1948, which Mr. Truman proudly reports and takes credit for of \$9,173,000,000.

Mr. Truman boasts of nearly an \$8,000,000,000 surplus beginning with the year 1947 up to and through 1951, but he does not tell the American people that the do-nothing Republican Eightieth Congress is responsible for this surplus.

Mr. Truman either completely forgot to explain that the Republican Congress was responsible for the surplus, over the opposition of the President and his leaders, or else his statement is intended to deceive the American people. The small and only surplus he or his predecessors can rightly claim credit for in the past 20 years, is the 1951 surplus of \$3,510,000,000 which resulted because tax money came in faster than they could spend it. It was later wiped out 2 months after July 1. In fact, Mr. Truman and his administration during the last 3 years of those 5 years when they had control of Congress not only spent the \$9,173,000,000 left by the Republican Congress in 1947 and 1948 but spent the 1951 surplus he refers to and \$1,422,000,000 in addition. His party has not, in fact, really balanced the budget in the past 20 years.

The following table of receipts and expenditures should be of interest:

Fiscal years ending June 30	Expenditures	Receipts	Surplus (+) or deficit (-)
1947.....	\$39,289,000,000	\$40,043,000,000	+\$754,000,000
1948.....	33,791,000,000	42,211,000,000	+8,419,000,000
1949.....	40,057,000,000	38,246,000,000	-1,811,000,000
1950.....	40,167,000,000	37,045,000,000	-3,122,000,000
1951.....	44,633,000,000	48,143,000,000	+3,510,000,000

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard from my colleague from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] the usual type of propaganda put out by the highly paid publicity staff of the Republican National Committee, prepared in advance for use whenever the opportunity presents itself on the floor of this House to question the motives, the integrity, and the purposes of our great President, Harry S. Truman. In his speech several days ago, the President stated very clearly and precisely what his views were on economy. He has practiced such a policy, the truth of which cannot be denied, notwithstanding the statement of my colleague from Illinois to the contrary. Unfortunately, the Republicans feel hurt whenever the President calls

attention to their shortcomings, and naturally they feel that by unleashing criticism such as we have just heard, by finding fault with every utterance of the President, they hope to be able to deceive the American people, instead of, as they charge, the President's deceiving them.

Contrary to the old adage about the elephant's memory, the followers of this slow-plodding animal have apparently already forgotten that the same tactics of criticizing and criticizing were used in the last campaign, and up to election day they sincerely believed they had fooled a majority of the American people into believing their false claims, but when the returns were in it was found that thinking Americans had again supported the President and his policies by assuring him another 4 years in the White House. I am more than satisfied that he will again succeed, if he chooses to become a candidate for reelection, in being retained at the head of our great Government, thus safeguarding the country from Republican misrule, from which it has suffered on occasion in the past.

It is amazing to me that they should be against this bill. Of course, the Democrats have always been helpful to the farmers. We have been helping them in every way. We provide everything for them, even to the extent of bringing in, expense free, Mexican labor. In this bill we are again trying to help the tillers of the soil by relieving them of the 15 percent tariff on baler twine. I do not know of what more we can do for them than we have already done. The Republicans, I note, have submitted a minority report, signed by eight Members. Just think of it. They go out to the country, to the farmers, here and there, and tell what great friends they are of the farmers, and when we, the Democrats, bring out legislation in the interest of the farmers, the Republicans invariably oppose it. As it is, here is a minority report as I have stated signed by eight Republicans, outstanding Members, against this legislation that aims to aid and assist the farmers. I understand the four great farm organizations are asking for this legislation, and it was upon the testimony and pleadings of farmers and these farm organizations that the Committee on Ways and Means reported this bill. Notwithstanding, as I stated earlier, eight outstanding Republicans signed the minority report against this bill that is intended to give this additional aid to the farmers, carrying out the policy of the Democratic Party to do everything humanly possible for the farming communities and for the farmers of this country. I congratulate the Committee on Ways and Means for bringing the bill in, not that I believe the farmers are really deserving. The farmers have become more prosperous than in all history under the Democratic administration. I do not know whether they always appreciate or recognize what we, I mean the Democratic Party, have done for them. If they are sensible, honest and sincere, and interested in the future welfare, they will show their appreciation by supporting the

Democratic Party which has brought continued prosperity not only to the farmers but to the entire Nation.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not want to talk on the rule because I think that perhaps in general debate we will get a little bit more information about this bill. I do not intend to vote against this rule, although I think it ought to be defeated. The gentleman on the Democratic side who is in charge of this bill is one of the outstanding Members of the House. He thinks as I do about this, that perhaps we ought to have a real explanation of this bill.

The gentleman from Illinois who preceded me, when he talked about how much the Democrats had done for the farmers, was making what he probably thought was a good argument, but it had little to do with the discussion before us.

Mr. Speaker, this bill hurts two of the best industries that are established in the State of Massachusetts. There are only about seven more in the whole United States that make binder twine or any other kind of twine or who are in the business of producing rope. There are people in my district who have been employed by the Plymouth Cordage Co. and the New Bedford Cordage Co. for 50 years, and a great many of them have been employed for 35 years. They know their business. This bill hurts them materially.

Mr. Speaker, I would be lax in my duty if I did not stand here and call your attention to this matter, because in the town of Plymouth alone I suppose there are 1,300 or 1,400 employees working in this industry, and if you include their families there must be 4,000 or 5,000 people dependent upon this industry for their living. They have done a good job, the best that could be done by people in the United States. So why would I not stand here and ask you to defeat this bill in its entirety?

The question of the tariff may enter into this matter, but the question of people walking the streets may make a big difference to the people of this country, because we have been through it and we do not want them to do it again. We do not want slave labor to compete with the people in Plymouth and New Bedford.

I ask the Members of the House, even if you adopt this rule, to defeat the bill. Let us have another year to look at it. The Committee on Ways and Means is looking desperately for more money. This bill calls for less money, when the Committee on Ways and Means is looking for more.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, somebody's figures are off somewhere. According to the best information I can get, about 1,000 workers are employed in the baler-twine and binder-twine phase of cordage production and of that number not over 500 are engaged in the pro-

duction of the baler twine with which this bill is concerned.

For the sake of argument let us assume labor would be adversely affected—and I will develop during the consideration of the bill that it will not be—and now consider the relative interest of the workers as opposed to the farmers and the people of the United States. Consider the 500 people who are employed in this phase of the industry—even if they were all employed in the gentlemen's district, which they are not. Two large producers produce over 80 percent of the baler twine in this country. Therefore, it is safe to assume that a large percent of the employment is outside of the gentleman's district. The only real force opposed to this bill is the Cordage Institute, which is a trust and a combine with headquarters located in the gentleman's State. But, the majority of the production of baler twine is not located in the gentleman's State. The fact of the matter is that when you take into account the interest of 500 employees in the baler-twine phase of production as against the 30,000,000 farmers and the 122,000,000 other citizens and consumers in the United States, where do you find the weight of the argument centered? It is centered in the interest of the 152,000,000 people minus the 500 people in the baler-twine phase of the cordage industry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1005, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], who is the author of the bill.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1005 provides for the free importation of baler twine by clarifying the intent of Congress in paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Your Committee on Ways and Means held public hearings on this legislation

for 4 days last July, and recommended passage in Report No. 771 dated July 27.

There are two major kinds of agricultural or harvesting binding twines. One is baler twine. The other is binder twine.

Baler twine is used for binding hay, straw, and fodder crops harvested in the field. It is a twine of recent development, first known in 1939 and of commercial importance first in the early 1940's. Binder twine is used for binding sheaves of grain, corn, and other crops, and for binding bales of hay in rotary type balers.

If congressional intent in paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act had been to provide only for the duty-free entry of "binder twine," those words would have been used. But the paragraph provides for the duty-free entry of "all binding twine."

Nevertheless, a Customs Bureau official ruled in 1945 that baler twine was subject to a duty of 15 percent ad valorem, and the case has been tied up in customs courts ever since. Legislative recourse appears to be the only proper answer to establishing congressional intent.

For more than 2 years I have been interested in this discrimination and have introduced bills in the last two Congresses which would provide for the free importation of baler twine. H. R. 1005 is designed for the benefit of farmers, and it is backed by those who have a true interest in farmers. Even though I introduced it, it is not one which will benefit my district. Do not vote for it on my account, for I do not have any farmers in my district except what you might call window-box farmers. My district is strictly urban, and they do not need baler twine or binder twine for the flowers and the chives which are produced for pleasure and kitchen use. Baler twine is used strictly by the farmer.

As is well known, farm equipment and supplies have traditionally been on the free list. It is my firm conviction that Congress intended that baler twine should be on the free list, and but for the erroneous ruling of the Commissioner of Customs, however sincere and honest he may have been in the ruling, baler twine would be on the free list. In the Tariff Act of 1930 Congress intended to cover three types of cordage and twine. First, cordage or rope; second, wrapping and tying twines used for boxes, packages, and bundles; and, third, agricultural binding twine. As a matter of fact, paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1930 put "all" agricultural binding twine on the free list.

Let me prove to you that there is no just basis for a distinction between baler twine and binder twine. I have in my hand a sample of both types of twine. Note the similarity. They are manufactured from the same raw materials—sisal, henequen, and abaca—commonly known as manila—fibers, on the same machines and in the same plants. They are shipped together under the same freight-rate classifications and the same quantity discounts are applicable to both. They are used by the same farmer in harvesting his crops.

There is no difference whatever between these two types of twine, except that baler twine has a greater number

of strands of sisal, henequen, and manila fibers, and therefore a greater tensile strength than binder twine.

A further indication of how erroneous was the Commissioner's ruling can be seen from the fact that the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, in the case of *Wilbur-Ellis Co. v. United States* (26 CCPA 402 (1939)), held that the baling of hay is an agricultural pursuit, and therefore wire baling ties, which were involved in that case, were free of duty as agricultural implements.

Now, get that: Wire was permitted free entry because baling hay was considered an agricultural pursuit, yet baler twine now by the Commissioner's ruling is not permitted free entry. That is just too ridiculous to contemplate. The use of baler twine for baling crops on the farm is as much an agricultural pursuit as the use of binder twine for binding certain crops.

Now we come to the so-called friends of the farmers who are opposing this bill. We run into them every time tariff legislation is under consideration. They are commonly known as the high-tariff boys. It is amazing how their hearts are bleeding for the farmers while considering this legislation. They are only concerned with his welfare they tell us, and they claim to be his spokesmen.

Let me comment parenthetically at this point on the statements of Mr. Roos, who is the principal spokesman for the Cordage Trust.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I have said that I would yield when I have completed my statement.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman says he is interjecting something parenthetically.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, let me comment parenthetically at this point on the statements of Mr. Roos, the spokesman for the trust, the voice of the cordage industry.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that the gentleman about whom the gentleman from Michigan is talking does not represent any trust.

Mr. DINGELL. That is my opinion; the gentleman can have his.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think we should have a quorum here.

Mr. DINGELL. That is all right, but let me point out that the first quorum move was made by the "friend of the farmers" from Nebraska. If you want to sink the bill by that or any other means you can sink it and take responsibility for such action.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a quorum present.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 171]

Abernethy	Evins	Meador
Adair	Fenton	Merrow
Allen, Calif.	Fine	Miller, Calif.
Allen, La.	Fisher	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Fogarty	Mitchell
Andresen,	Frazier	Morano
August H.	Gamble	Morgan
Angell	Garmatz	Morrison
Armstrong	Gavin	Morton
Bakewell	Gordon	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Barrett	Granahan	Nelson
Eates, Ky.	Granger	O'Konski
Bentsen	Green	O'Neill
Bishop	Gwinn	Ostertag
Blackney	Hagen	Passman
Boggs, La.	Hall,	Patman
Bosone	Leonard W.	Philbin
Bow	Harden	Potter
Boykin	Hart	Powell
Breen	Harvey	Quinn
Brooks	Havener	Rabaut
Brownson	Hébert	Rains
Buckley	Hedrick	Ramsay
Busbey	Heffernan	Reams
Butler	Heller	Redden
Byrne, N. Y.	Herter	Rees, Kans.
Camp	Hill	Rhodes
Canfield	Hillings	Richards
Carlyle	Hinshaw	Rivers
Carnahan	Hoeven	Rogers, Colo.
Case	Hoffman, Ill.	Roosevelt
Chatham	Holfield	Sadlak
Chenoweth	Holmes	St. George
Clemente	Horan	Scott, Hardie
Clevenger	Howell	Secrest
Cole, N. Y.	Hunter	Shafer
Colmer	Irving	Sheehan
Combs	Jackson, Calif.	Shelley
Cooley	Jenison	Sheppard
Corbett	Johnson	Short
Cotton	Jonas	Sikes
Coudert	Jones, Mo.	Sittler
Cox	Jones,	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Hamilton C.	Stefan
Curtis, Nebr.	Kearns	Stigler
Dague	Kee	Stockman
Davis, Ga.	Kelly, N. Y.	Tackett
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	Talle
Dawson	Kerr	Taylor
Deane	Kersten, Wis.	Teague
DeGraffenried	Kilburn	Thomas
Dempsey	Klein	Thornberry
Denny	Lane	Vail
Denton	Latham	Vorys
Dollinger	LeCompte	Weichel
Dolliver	Lesinski	Wheeler
Donohue	Lind	Wigglesworth
Donovan	Lucas	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn	McCarthy	Wilson, Tex.
Doyle	McCormack	Withrow
Durham	McCulloch	Wolverton
Eaton	McGrath	Wood, Ga.
Ellsworth	Mack, Ill.	Wood, Idaho
Elston	Marshall	Yates
Engle	Martin, Iowa	Zablocki

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1035, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 229 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as I said just before we were interrupted by the point of no quorum, Mr. Roos, the spokesman for the Cordage Institute, the trust, the combine, the monopoly, in

answer to Chairman Doughton's inquiry about the critical shortages in baler twine about which the farmers were complaining, said that the shortage was due to the fact that the dealers were hoarding baler twine, a ridiculous, untenable statement. It is just like saying that an automobile dealer is hoarding automobiles to keep from making a profit. That goes to show you the kind of arguments they are advancing against this bill.

It is very enlightening to look at the record of the hearings on this bill. The four national farm organizations and every farmer who contacted our committee were unequivocal in their support of the bill. Yet we are told that they "know not whereof they speak." The farmers say that they cannot get baler twine at any price. The "high-tariff boys" say there is plenty of baler twine being produced, and even granted that there is a temporary shortage, they inform us that it appears likely that both supply and price will shortly be much more favorable.

I would like to see you sell that argument to a farmer who cannot get baler twine at any price and has his fields covered with rotting hay. We all know that a farm of any size that raises any crops, whatever they may be, also produces hay. This means that if you have any farmers at all in your district they will benefit by this bill.

The "high-tariff boys" point with pride to the fact that the domestic manufacturers of baler twine have had an increase in their fiber costs of 15 cents per pound, yet they have advanced their price only 9.7 cents per pound.

This in and of itself indicates on its face that there is a monopoly existing on the part of domestic producers of baler twine and that they have been bleeding the farmer for every cent they can get out of him. A very pertinent question is: Why have not the domestic producers of baler twine long ago reduced the price of the twine to the farmers if they can now absorb some of the increase in the price of their raw materials. Another thing, do not let the pleas for the domestic producers of baler twine fool you. Two of these producers account for 80 percent of the domestic production of baler twine. If that is not a monopoly, I would like to see one.

The opponents of this bill try to convince us that the farmer will benefit only a few cents a year even if baler twine is imported duty-free. Today the price in Canada is 29.43 cents per pound, while the United States price is 34.67 cents per pound. This amounts to a difference of 5.24 cents per pound. It is estimated that 125,000,000 pounds of baler twine will be used by farmers in 1951. When we multiply this quantity by the difference between the Canadian and the United States price, we arrive at the figure of \$6,550,000. I am yet to be convinced that this can be adequately termed a "negligible" saving to farmers. This saving belongs to the farmer and in turn to the consuming public who are the actual sufferers from the greed of the domestic manufacturers.

Other important benefits will be derived by farmers as a result of the enactment of this legislation. The use of baler twine is the most efficient and economical means the farmer has in baling his crops. One man can operate an automatic pickup baling machine which uses baler twine. It takes 2 to 4 men to operate an automatic pickup baling machine which uses wire. This saving in labor alone is of critical importance to the farmer now since many of his sons have been called into the Armed Forces and farm labor is in critical supply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. The use of baler twine has an additional advantage for the farmer. It is much safer than the use of wire because it often happens that the wire gets mixed in with the hay and other fodder crops which the farmer feeds his cattle, resulting in their death.

We are told by the opponents of this legislation that laborers engaged in the manufacture of baling twine will be thrown out of work if this legislation should be enacted. My record attests to the fact that I have been a friend of labor long before I came to Congress, and I will not even argue the point that I would do anything which would be detrimental to the worker. Contrary to adversely affecting laborers engaged in the manufacture of baling twine, it is my firm conviction that enactment of this legislation will help them. Now, many of the farmers who can afford to do so have resorted to the use of wire baling machines. If the farmers cannot be assured of an adequate supply of baler twine, many more of them will, of necessity, have to resort to substitute methods of baling their crops. The high price and the shortage in supply of any commodity, we all know, encourage substitution. Converting to wire balers not only will throw workers engaged in making baling twine out of work, but it will be a very expensive proposition to the farmer and in turn increase the cost of food to consumers.

I think we can leave it to the manufacturing industry in our country to compete with any country in the world as to the quality and price of the baler twine which they produce. This will mean additional jobs instead of fewer jobs. An example right on this point can be seen from the fact that even though farm machinery has been imported duty-free over the years, the United States is still the greatest manufacturer of farm machinery in the world, and the quality of our farm machinery is such that even if it is higher priced, everyone still clamors for it.

The Cordage Trust tells us that foreign manufacturers of baler twine can sell twine much cheaper in the United States than their members can because of the differences in labor costs. Yet, they themselves admit that all manufacturers in the world are on an equal footing as far as the purchase of raw material and machinery used in the manufacture

of baler twine are concerned, since these items must be imported. They admit that the cost of labor in the manufacture of baler twine accounts for only about 10 to 14 percent of the selling price of baler twine. This cannot represent any great advantage or disadvantage to the Cordage Institute members as far as competitive prices are concerned.

There is definitely a critical shortage of baler twine which has been artificially created by the Cordage Trust which enjoys a monopoly almost unheard of today. Even at the exorbitant prices which they are demanding from the farmers right now, and which the farmers in many instances are willing to pay, the farmer still cannot get anywhere near an adequate supply of baler twine. The Cordage Trust has attempted to produce figures to dispell this shortage. These figures are of little comfort to the farmer. He knows where he stands. He is short of baler twine, his harvest is rotting in the fields, and he cannot get baler twine at any price. You cannot explain away this shortage by statistics.

The trust would have us believe putting baler twine on the free list will ruin them. Binder twine has been imported free of duty since 1896 and domestic producers still supply about 75 percent of our total binder twine requirements.

There are no adequate substitutes for baler twine. It cannot be made of any of the domestic fibers such as cotton. The only way to relieve the situation now facing the farmer is to enact this bill, and assure him an adequate supply of baler twine.

Since the free importation of baler twine benefits not only the farmer but the consuming public, enactment of this legislation is of the greatest importance. I have no doubt that the ruling of the Commissioner of Customs will eventually be overturned in the courts, but the farmer needs immediate relief and cannot await a successful litigation of the status of baler twine under the Tariff Act.

Congressional action is necessary and we should not leave it up to the courts to determine what was the intent of Congress. We ourselves should clarify our intent if it is or has ever been doubtful.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill before the House, H. R. 1005, is to permanently remove the tariff of 15 percent ad valorem on baler twine. This type of twine first came into use in 1939. Baler twine is used principally in automatic pick-up balers to tie and bind bales of hay, straw, and fodder crops. There are some of us in the House of Representatives who believe that the American market is the greatest and best market in the world, and also that the protection of our market from ruinous foreign competition through protective tariff duties has given the people of the United States the highest standard of living in the world. Tariff protection is sound Republican doctrine. Therefore, whenever a legislative proposal to depart from tariff protection

is presented to the House of Representatives, the branch of Congress in which it must under the Constitution originate, a review of our tariff history may be appropriate. Such a review is important in peace times, and it is doubly so in times of war.

It is doubtful if any influence other than foreign influence would urge the removal of a tariff in opposition to the recommendation of our Defense Department. This being true it is proper to inquire what our Munitions Board has to say on the subject of the removal of the 15 percent ad valorem tariff on baler twine, as it may be inimical to our national defense. When it became apparent that H. R. 1005, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material was scheduled for consideration, I wrote to the Munitions Board on May 29 of this year requesting the reaction of the Munitions Board as to how the removal of the tariff on baler twine might affect our national-defense program.

I received a reply from the Munitions Board on June 6, 1951, the pertinent part of which reads as follows:

From the standpoint of national defense this seems to be more important than a minor and probably temporary reduction in the price of baler twine. Maintenance of domestic manufacturing facilities is essential for any requirements for rope and twine in agriculture, mining, shipping, and for military use. Therefore, the Munitions Board is opposed to the elimination of the remaining small duty on baler twine.

I inserted the full letter from the Munitions Board on pages 31 and 32 in the hearings on H. R. 1005. Such a letter relating to our national defense in time of war would, it seemed to me, be a sufficient answer to any pressure from domestic sources to reduce this tariff. I felt sure that the real insistence that action be taken to reduce the tariff on baler twine as against our program of national defense must come from foreign influence. In appraising proposed legislation, its sponsors and their purposes are of importance in determining the merits of a particular bill. I have applied these recognized yardsticks to H. R. 1005 with surprising results. The Members of the House are fully aware that we have the Federal Lobbying Act on the statute books. It is a significant fact that on January 31, 1951, the same month that H. R. 1005, the baler twine tariff bill, was introduced, Mr. Donald D. Hogate registered in accordance with the Federal Lobbying Act as a representative of the Brantford Cordage Mill, in connection with H. R. 1005.

The Brantford Cordage Mill, a manufacturer of baler twine, is located in the Province of Ontario, Canada. The city of Detroit is its natural port of entry for Brantford baler twine.

The Brantford Cordage Mill employs Canadian labor. It pays taxes in Canada—not in the United States. The wage scale in Canada is lower than it is in the United States. This bill H. R. 1005 viewed from every angle is completely against the interests of American labor. The enactment of the bill can

under no stretch of the imagination benefit the farmer but on the other hand it can and will, if enacted into law, turn over our cordage industry to foreign manufacturers who pay not a dime in American taxes nor one cent to American labor.

The application of Mr. Hogate shows that he receives \$1,000 per month and expenses for this work, and his quarterly reports indicate that these expenditures have been for news releases and communications.

It is obvious that Mr. Hogate has done a most efficient job as a lobbyist for the foreign interests which he represents, otherwise H. R. 1005 would not be on the floor today. It requires a man of prestige, personality, and ability to persuade leaders of farm organizations to support legislation to weaken, if not to ultimately destroy, the cordage industries of this country which have given outstanding service to the farmers of the United States. I am sure that it must be apparent that a vote for H. R. 1005 is a vote for foreign twine mills and foreign labor, and a vote against our national defense program—a vote against American labor, a vote against American industry, a vote against Federal and State tax collections, and finally, a vote against the American farmer.

I repeat it is of the greatest importance to the farmer to have a great and rich market for his produce. Protection is a policy which protects and stimulates American industry and insures high wages for American labor and provides the greatest market in the world for the American farmer. The American farmer, as well as the American industrialists and American workingmen, must be protected from the invasion of that market by cheap foreign competition.

It is axiomatic that a tariff law destructive to one line of endeavor in the United States, will lay its burdens upon every line of endeavor. You cannot strike the manufacturer with a low tariff without striking the labor he employs and you cannot strike the labor he employs without striking the farmer who produces for that labor.

It is also true that as the manufacturer needs the business of the farmer it is to his interest that business be kept worth while and, as the farmer depends for his measure of success upon the buying ability of labor, he in turn will do best when labor is fully employed, and labor is fully employed only when we make in the United States the bulk of what we consume in our own country.

Before the passage of the Wilson low-tariff bill, President Harrison said, in December 1892, relative to conditions:

There never has been a time in our history when work was so abundant or wages were so high, whether measured by the currency in which they are paid or by their own power to supply the necessities and comforts of life.

On August 8, 1893, after it was known that a low-tariff measure would soon be put in force, President Cleveland had this contrasting story to tell. He said:

With plenteous crops, with abundant promise of remunerative production and manufacture, with unusual invitation to safe investment, and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial

distress and fear have sprung up on every side. * * * Values supposed to be fixed are fast becoming conjectural and loss and failure have invaded every branch of business.

It will be recalled that the enactment of the Dingley bill, enacted under the administration of William McKinley, saved the Nation from the devastating results of the low-tariff Wilson bill.

It was during the debate on the Wilson bill that Hon. Jonathan P. Dolliver made a prophecy. He said:

I, for one, am not discouraged even if Congress should enact this—

Wilson low tariff—

into law, because I know that the people of the United States having learned their lesson in the midst of broken fortunes and impoverished industries will come back speedily to the historic standards of American common sense.

The people did return to the historic Payne-Aldrich covenant with prosperity in consequence.

Memory is short, however, and in time experience under a low tariff was forgotten, eyes were closed to truth. The Payne-Aldrich covenant with prosperity was abandoned.

Let us not forget that it has always been the policy of our Government to guard against the destruction of those industries vitally essential to our national security. Departure from this policy prior to World War I, when our chemical industry was crippled and practically destroyed by dumping on the part of Germany.

Now then, those of us who feel a deep concern on the subject of national security do not care to brush aside this vital issue relating to our national defense by repealing a tariff on baler twine to which repeal the Munitions Board objects. The members of the minority, true to the traditions of the Republican Party, believe in national security and in tariff protection, consider the most important single consideration respecting H. R. 1005 is the adverse effect on our national security if the tariff on baler twine is repealed.

The time has come to stop, look, and listen.

For the last 17 years, operating under a trade-agreement program, tariffs have been cut to the lowest point in our history. The drive has been to surrender our markets to the foreign nations of the world. The reciprocal trade-agreement policy was inaugurated by Alger Hiss. It had his blessing and that of the other Communists in the State Department.

Over 95 percent of everything in the aggregate produced in the United States is sold in our domestic market. To surrender this market is to strike at the very heart of our Republic. None knew this better than the men who framed our Constitution, and those who sat in the First Congress to assemble under it. It was a great day for our young Republic when on the second day of the First Congress of the United States, the House of Representatives being in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, James Madison, who practically wrote the Constitution; James Madison,

the loyal disciple of Thomas Jefferson; James Madison, the second Democratic President of the United States, offered a resolution that specific duties should be levied on spirituous liquors, wines, teas, sugar, pepper, cocoa, and spices, and an ad valorem duty on all other articles.

What was the preamble to this legislation proposed by Mr. Madison? The preamble to his resolution read like this:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufacturers, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported.

Mr. Madison further said that he was "looking to the preservation of internal industries upon which the Government and the people could rely for strength and well-being."

Andrew Jackson, who is now deified by an annual \$100-a-plate money-raising campaign fund—tax free—in a letter under date of April 26, 1824, to Dr. A. H. Coleman, in discussing the tariff in that letter, Andrew Jackson placed protection first and then said:

Beyond this I look at the tariff with an eye to the proper distribution of labor and to revenue. * * * It is time that we should become a little more Americanized; and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England, feed our own; or else in a short time by continuing our present policy—

The low tariff policy between 1816 and 1824—

we shall all be rendered paupers ourselves.

A review of the tariff cuts throughout our history shows that this country never has prospered and never can prosper by taking our markets away from home producers and surrendering them to foreigners.

It has been the experience under every low tariff act that when a country has captured our market from an American industry, the price of the foreign article is raised so that the American consumer is helpless and has to pay more by far than he ever did for the product of the domestic producer.

Every conceivable charge has been made against every tariff bill seeking to protect the farmers, the laborers, and industry from the importation of the products of foreign cheap labor.

The one thing, the commanding thing, is to save our home markets, the markets in which we sell the greatest part of what we produce, to our own citizens—to those who eat in America, dress up in America, and build new homes in America.

Our farmers of today do not recall what the Wilson low tariff did to agriculture in 1920 and 1921. Some of the very old timers who traversed the agricultural and livestock regions have not, I am sure, forgotten the hardships that were visited upon the stockmen in that low-tariff period.

Millions of pounds of wool and beef, and billions of pounds of vegetable oils were brought in from foreign lands and dumped upon our markets at a price ruinously below the cost of production in America. The effect of such staggering foreign competition was devastating to the economy of our agriculture.

The history of the ruinous effect of low-tariff legislation has repeated itself exactly the same way five different times during the life of the Republic. Five different times prosperity has been regained under protection. Every time we yield to the pressure of the importers to cut or to repeal a protective tariff, it is to export our payrolls, close our domestic industry, and then suffer the penalty of the price of imports being raised far above the former domestic price.

The removal of the 15 percent ad valorem tariff on baler twine cannot aid the farmer this season, and there is no evidence to show that he will derive any benefits in the future from this free trade move. It may benefit the importer of baler twine by creating a condition that will ultimately destroy the domestic baler-twine industry and throw 9,000 American workmen out of employment. The American farmer should be the last one to sponsor a free-trade policy, even in the slightest degree. There will have to be an end to supplying foreign nations with our taxpayers' dollars to provide a foreign market for our farm and other products.

The American market is the American farmers' future hope. The export of our factories and payrolls will eventually destroy our domestic market.

The Department of Defense has registered its disapproval of this proposal to remove the tariff on baler twine. This bill is an importer's bill masquerading as domestic farm legislation.

I want to point out here that this man Hogate has done, as I said, a magnificent job, and I say this to you in all sincerity, in convincing the farm leaders of this country—not the farmers but the farm leaders of this country that they will benefit by the destruction of our cordage industry, and yielding to Canada and Canada's industries. But, it will result in simply robbing our Treasury of taxes and custom duties, and also in throwing labor out of employment and forcing the farmers to pay the foreign price. You will get some more information on this from one of my colleagues when he speaks.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If this bill is passed, and as a result the few twine mills remaining in the United States are forced completely out of business, will not American farmers then be put in the position where they will have to pay whatever price the foreign twine producers want to charge in the future? Is that not correct?

Mr. REED of New York. That has been the history every single time we have lowered the tariff. Consider the dye situation, if you please. What happened to us then? During the war it almost caused our defeat.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If that happens, then it will be to the detriment of our farmers, and this legislation would injure the farmers of the United States rather than benefit them.

Mr. REED of New York. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] indicts the farmers and their spokesmen in this matter.

The original author of the twine bill was the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, HUGH BUTLER. If anybody can pull the wool over his eyes, I am sorry for him and for the farmers who sent him here from the great State of Nebraska.

I want to take the opportunity now to point out how totally wrong the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is as regards the letter upon which he rests his entire case as far as the safety of the country is concerned. The gentleman from New York referred to that letter which he had printed on page 5 of the report, signed by C. W. Middleton, vice chairman for production and requirements. He is the subordinate of Mr. John D. Small, who is Chairman of the Munitions Board.

I agree 100 percent with the contention of the gentleman from New York that we should consider very seriously the position of the Munitions Board on enactment of H. R. 1005. The gentleman's comments on the Board's position are based upon a premature letter secured under misapprehension from the Munitions Board in order to bolster his stand for high tariffs, whether the farmer, the consumer, or anybody else suffers.

We have all seen through this cloak; and as a further indication of his frantic effort to bolster his position by any means possible I would like to read a letter addressed to me, dated August 25, from Chairman John D. Small, of the Munitions Board, wherein Mr. Small has this to say:

This is in answer to your inquiry of August 15, 1951, relative to H. R. 1005, a bill providing for the free importation of baler twine.

In order to supply the Honorable DANIEL A. REED expeditiously with certain factual information which was requested in his letter to me of May 29, 1951, Mr. Middleton's reply of June 6, 1951, to Congressman REED was sent prior to full development of the Department of Defense position on this bill. The Department of Defense has no objection to the enactment of H. R. 1005.

Even the attempt to defeat this bill on the grounds that it would seriously hamper our defense effort is once and for all put in its proper place by Mr. Small's letter of disavowal.

The gentleman from New York and I secured these letters as individual members of the Committee on Ways and Means for our own information and guidance. He, unfortunately, contacted an employee of the Board, while I contacted its Chairman at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

(Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H. R. 1005, provides for the

free importation of baler twine. This bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, as I recall it, by a vote of 17 to 6. Several of our distinguished colleagues on the Republican side of the House voted for the bill and, as I understand, are still supporting it.

Baler twine is now subject to a duty of 15 percent ad valorem. It is used primarily in automatic pick-up hay balers to tie and bind bales of hay, straw, and fodder crops. It first came into use in 1939 and its use has increased materially since that time, due to the steadily increasing use of automatic pick-up twine balers by farmers throughout the country. The farmers find that such baling is efficient and economical, and that the use of this baling twine is much more desirable than the use of baling wire, because it is much safer for livestock. Binder twine which is also an agricultural twine and which is used primarily for binding sheaves of grain and corn and in some cases hay, has been duty-free since 1896. In many other instances Congress has exempted from duty commodities and implements used in agricultural pursuits.

We have this simple situation presented today through the consideration of the pending bill: What is called binder twine is on the free list, and what has since been termed baler twine is on the dutiable list with a 15 percent duty. The only difference in the two products is that baler twine contains a few more strands of fiber than binder twine. They are both used by the farmers throughout the country. So the Committee on Ways and Means felt that it was only fair and proper to respond to the request of the farmers throughout the country to make this essential farm commodity subject to the same duty-free entry as the other type of twine that is used by the farmers.

Witnesses representing all of the farm organizations of the country appeared before the committee strongly supporting the pending bill; in fact, the great support that is afforded this measure comes from the farm organizations of the country, and all the farmers who have expressed themselves to members of the committee are in favor of this legislation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How much will the Government lost by the passage of this bill?

Mr. COOPER. I do not have the exact figures before me, but the effect on the revenue will be very slight. All of the departments of the Government that gave any expression on the measure are in support of it, and the Department of Agriculture has strongly supported the passage of this bill in a communication to the committee which appears in the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In respect to the effect on the revenue, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts that anything that helps the

farmer helps the revenues of the Government, because it enables him to make larger profits and pay larger income taxes; and what is lost by the reduction of the tariff will be more than offset by the increased income tax the farmer will pay as a result of this legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman deal with the attitude of the Department of Defense? In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York the Department wrote him a letter giving in full the reasons why the Department of Defense was opposed to the bill. Then the gentleman from Michigan, to our surprise, read a letter repudiating that but not giving the reasons for the repudiation. Would the gentleman from Tennessee be able to explain what the reason for the difference was?

Mr. COOPER. In the limited time available I will not perhaps be able to develop that question as fully as the gentleman from New York might desire, but the fact is that the head the Munitions Board has unequivocally stated that the previous letter written to the gentleman from New York was written before the full facts were developed, and now in another letter dated just a few days ago the Chairman of the Munitions Board unequivocally states that the Board has no objection to the enactment of this bill.

Mr. KEATING. Was the second letter submitted to the committee for its consideration?

Mr. COOPER. The second letter was dated August 28, 1951, which was after the bill was reported by the committee.

I am strongly supporting the pending bill and urge its passage.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to what has been said in this debate that has arisen concerning the recommendation of the Munitions Board, let us review what has been said. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] wrote a letter to the Munitions Board. This Board immediately replied.

The Board gave its reasons why it recommended against the passage of this legislation. Now, then, it appears that somebody secured a letter from the Chairman of the Board. I wonder where this effort came from and why the Board did not report its action to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] made the inquiry and they replied to it. Somebody must have made inquiry of the Chairman and he comes back with a different kind of an answer. It would seem that this Chairman should at least have given Mr. REED some information with reference to this last letter.

But the man who replied to Mr. REED made several very significant statements. He gave reasons for his position. Here is why he says the Board is against the importation of this material free of duty. He says that in the production of this commodity there is consumed a com-

modity that the Government needs in its stockpile. That commodity is sisal. In the letter he wrote to Mr. REED he gave the figures to show how much more sisal is consumed year after year in its production, and indicating why it is really a dangerous matter so far as stockpiling is concerned. This commodity called sisal is a very important commodity.

Let me give you the figures in Mr. REED's letter. It is stated in that letter that in 1946 the amount of sisal consumed was 13,100,000 pounds; in 1947, 24,600,000; in 1948, 27,100,000; 1949, 34,400,000; and in 1950 it is estimated at 56,500,000.

Now those figures indicate why the Board made this decision. It is purely a matter of conservation of sisal.

It has been stated here several times that these two twines are exactly alike, the only difference being in size. That is not right, that is not true. These two twines are not exactly alike. The component parts are different. The binder twine has got less of this important commodity we call sisal in it than the other, and, besides, we country boys who have been raised on a farm know something about it. I have used this binder twine on many hot days. The baler twine comes along and it has some different commodities in it. It is appropriate for certain purposes. Binder twine is used for binding wheat. When the wheat is bound it will in a short period go through the thresher. This baler twine binds and bales the hay and that hay must be bound firmly and the twine must resist the attack of rodents and insects. This baler twine is treated to prevent the bugs and worms from cutting it. Hay when baled is sometimes kept for many months before it is used.

It is a different commodity, maybe not vitally different, but it is sufficiently different not to be the same, as has been indicated here.

It is true that the farm organizations have come out in favor of this legislation. I have high regard for the opinion of these organizations. I do not speak for the farm organizations, but I dare say that last spring when they made these announcements that was the way they felt about it. There was a shortage of baler twine in the country. I do not know what they would say now. The season is practically over. This commodity is not going to be in great demand now. On behalf of the manufacturers of this commodity let me say to you that they anticipated the best they could. There is evidence before our committee that those who manufactured this commodity last year made about twice as much as they did in previous years. However, everybody knows that the advance in the use of the baler twine has been phenomenal. It has been only a few years since you saw haystacks being up all over the country, but the last year or two there have been very few stacks going up. The demand for baler twine has really outstripped the production.

Now, what is the use of getting agitated over this? The season is over, and by next season those who manufacture this commodity will have learned their lesson and will meet the demands. They will manufacture more of it and

produce it so that it will be more equitably distributed. I have a letter here from a man who says that a man from his community went to town and bought five or six times as much baler twine as he needed and hoarded it. There is no question but that there has been a black market in baler twine, because some people get scared and buy up the supply, and some get more than they need and others do not get enough.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. If you repeal the tariff on baler twine, has anybody promised that the price will go down to the farmer?

Mr. JENKINS. Here will be the outcome of that. History has proven this proposition to be true all the time, and that is this: Whenever we open our door to foreign importations and we put our manufacturing plants out of business, there the foreign manufacturers will increase their prices as much as the trade will stand. Where does it come from now? It comes from Mexico and Canada, and just as soon as we nullify the effectiveness of our own manufacturing plants and we cut down their production, the prices will go up on the commodity that comes into the country, and that has always been true.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. We just had an experience where England raised the price of rubber and tin three times its value, and the Department of Defense said that would cost everybody in this country three times as much as it did before. Is that not right?

Mr. JENKINS. That is what I tried to illustrate, and the gentleman's statement illustrates it more clearly.

Mr. Chairman, I know that it might be difficult for some to vote against the recommendation of the farmers in this case, but someone on the committee asked one farm organization a very important and pertinent question on this subject. He said, "Who are you going to sell your production to if you are going to buy everything you buy from somebody else? Where is the farmer going to get his market? In Mexico or Canada?" Everybody knows that Canada has all the farm production it needs and Mexico has practically nothing. When the American farmer begins to reason this thing out, and when this distressful hour has passed, I think they will change their minds.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman something of the same question I asked a moment ago. If we, by the passage of this legislation, destroy the binder and baler twine industry here in the United States, whether or not the farmers of this Nation will not then be at the mercy of foreign manufacturers, and have to pay in the future any price that they may

wish to charge for baler twine in order to get it?

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And if we put the farmers of the Nation at the mercy of the foreign producers, then we will not be doing the farmers any benefit by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS. Absolutely not, and I think the farmers will reason this out themselves. This one man that we put the question to indicated that he had already seen the light at that time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. This is a bill which, of course, may seem very difficult for representatives from agricultural districts to vote against. I ask the gentleman this question: If we permit binder twine or anything else to come into this country duty-free, if we permit the things that the farmer uses to come into this country duty-free, then by the same token could not the consumers of America expect, in all fairness, that the farm products come into this country gratis, duty-free? Now we are embarking upon a very dangerous program, as I see it.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right, we will not be able to anticipate all the consequences.

Mr. JENSEN. As the gentleman said, the binder twine needs for this season are practically over.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. We have a lot of things to consider when we vote a bill of this nature, because we are trying to keep fats and oils out of this country which would otherwise destroy the farmer's price.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. And we folks from the agriculture districts are in favor of that.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman from Iowa is well recognized as a friend of the farmer and one who knows the farmer's problems; and, not boasting, I think I do, too, and I think it would be rather dangerous for the farmer to ask us to go too far on this kind of a program just for this one commodity.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right, because if we open the door, if we vote for this bill, then to be consistent we must vote to bring in other products free of duty.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. And you get yourself in a precarious position.

Mr. JENKINS. I think we have developed that. Just see what the laboring people of this country have to say. We had some testimony to that effect, and I would like for the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the great farmer from Detroit, to listen to what the laboring men have to say about this proposition. This is what they say:

According to our estimates, the average United States farmer would possibly save only \$1.60 per year if there were a reduction in the duty and the twine were imported on the free list. We cannot imagine that this sum represents a sufficient enough amount really to affect the economy of the farmer. It is far more important to American agriculture that the supply of the product be guaranteed at all times either in peace or war.

The advantages to the foreign producers is not sufficiently great to warrant this change in tariff policy.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. Can the gentleman tell us how many men are employed in the industry now producing twine?

Mr. JENKINS. I think the hearings indicate that there are about nine thousand employed. Just remember that the production of binder twine and baler twine is a very small part of the production of the cordage industry. The time will come when these cordage industries will have to make rope for the Army and the Navy. They will have to make a lot of different things out of the raw material that they handle. It may come to a place where it will be difficult for them to do these things if we hamper their production.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He specifically referred to me in regard to a matter that I think in fairness I ought to be able to reply to.

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Reference was made in the letter from which the gentleman quoted to a saving of \$1.60 per farmer. According to my calculation, 30,000,000 farmers times \$1.60 is \$48,000,000 a year if all of them were involved which of course is not true. I have said this bill will save the farmer over \$6,000,000. That is an awful lot of money for the farmer about whom you have been crying, but now you are not willing to help him. I will put my record in support of labor against yours at any time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Only \$5,000,000 is involved.

Mr. JENKINS. May I reply to the great farmer from Detroit by saying that I wonder what his great interest in this proposition is when on the face of the things those who generally speak for labor have indicated clearly their opposition to this bill? I don't know where he gets the figures that there are 30,000,000 farmers in the country. He has his figures mixed. There are about 30,000,000 people—men, women and children on the farm. There are, I think, about 3,000,000 farm units in the country. The amount of duty involved will I think be well below \$5,000,000.

Mr. DINGELL. My labor people did not tell me that. They will stand behind me just as I will stand and have stood behind them, I will assure my brother from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. All the testimony given to the Ways and Means Committee by those representing labor is in opposition to the proposed legislation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit surprised that a bill of this sort has caused such a commotion this afternoon. I am more than surprised, I am amazed at the position taken by the alleged friends of the farmers,

those that have been crying for years in the House of Representatives that they are friends of the farmers.

The only reason there is any opposition to this bill, when you get down to brass tacks, is the fact that a few, perhaps six or seven, cordage manufacturers have made objection to it. That is the only reason there is a fight on this bill. The question is—are you going to legislate in favor of a few manufacturers of cordage and baler twine as against the farmers of the country? It was shown to the Committee on Ways and Means that farmers all over the country—not merely in one area, but all over the country, when they went to the store to get baler twine they found it was simply unobtainable. The stores did not have any. As a result, the farmers had no twine with which to bale their hay, which resulted perhaps in a loss of many, many thousands of dollars, and perhaps in a loss of valuable foodstuffs.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON] brought up the question as to whether or not the prices would go down to the farmers, if this import duty was removed. If the prices did not go down, Mr. Chairman, I submit: Will the manufacturer be hurt if prices remain the same? How can the manufacturers be hurt if the prices remain the same? I tell you it is not a matter altogether of price. It is a matter of getting the baler twine so that the farmers will be able to bale their hay.

Are you going to put yourselves on record as telling the four major farm organizations that they do not know what they are talking about when they ask for the passage of this bill? Are you going to listen to their recommendations? Are you going to go against what they recommended when they came before the committee—the four of them—perhaps for the first time in history that they have all had the exact same viewpoint? Are you going to go on record and say "You do not know what you are talking about even though you represent practically all of the farmers in the Nation?"

Mr. Chairman, talking about the poor employees who will be affected, of course, anybody who has heard that argument advanced before by those on the left side of the aisle know that it is nothing much more than crocodile tears. There are very, very few employees who will be affected by the passage of this bill. As I said, I do not think there are more than six or seven cordage plants, and perhaps not a thousand employees affected. Whereas, you might be affecting 30,000,000 farmers. Mr. Chairman, this is the old fight by those who want to maintain high tariffs regardless of the harm to the American consuming public, and the American farmer, and the American business man. They want to maintain high tariffs so that a few can make greater and greater profits. The prices of baler twine has increased so tremendously that it has hurt the farmers' pocketbook. Worse than that Mr. Chairman—worse than hurting the farmers' pocketbook, it has resulted in the waste of hay. It is the same old

question of the Republican Party—those who want to adhere to the principle of high tariffs.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has referred to the small number of employees affected. I think—of course, it was unintentional on his part—that he is inaccurate in his statement. The gentleman refers to only 1,000 employees. I know of one company which employs something like 1,400 employees in this industry, and there are many of these companies throughout the country which would be adversely affected by this particular legislation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman, I think, is referring to plants that produce not only baler twine, but binder twine and other cordage, meaning rope—all different types of rope, heavy rope and light rope and so on, which is somewhat similar to baler twine. If I may say to the gentleman, why should we make a distinction between baler twine which is used for baling hay, and binder twine, and binder wire?

Binder wire and binder twine come in duty free. Do you want to impose on baler twine a 15-percent ad valorem duty, when they are all used for practically the same purpose? If we do that we are doing an inequitable thing to the baler twine. That is simply what you are advocating—I mean those who are opposing this bill.

Mr. KEATING. I am not at all sure that it is a fair argument to say that because you sack one company by letting other kinds of twine in free and allowing foreign competition in that department that you should go further and now go after that same company again and decrease their business and throw their employees out on the street because of increased foreign competition.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman would advocate placing a 15-percent ad valorem duty on binder twine?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know the situation with regard to that. I would not advocate that. I do know that the passage of this legislation would be a very serious blow to certain companies with which I am familiar. I question whether we would not be properly serving the interests of everyone by simply extending this temporarily to the present situation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The firms making binding twine have not been hurt because the material that is used for binder twine is coming in free of duty.

Mr. DINGELL. As a matter of fact, speaking about the baler twine and binder twine, there is no difference except in the tensile strength and the thickness. It is used by the same people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You do not use binder twine in baling hay. That might be Detroit farming but that is not real farming.

Mr. DINGELL. Oh, why does not the gentleman talk sense?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman can understand sense, I will be glad to talk sense.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further, because I do not want to get into discussions of outside matters.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, as he said he would earlier in the debate?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not want to get into any argument and I do not want anybody else on the floor to get into any argument.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand the gentleman is taking his position because of his interest in the farmer.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No, not altogether.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But partially?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would not say that now. The gentleman does not want to accuse me of that, I am sure.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Are you taking it because you are interested in labor?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman knows I have always voted in the general interest of the entire country and not for any one particular segment or anything like that. I have voted for every measure which I thought would be for the benefit of the farmer and the laborer and business and for the general interest of the entire country. I am not a sectional man and I have never voted sectionally and the gentleman knows that. I do not think he should intimate that I am voting just for the sake of the farmer for this measure.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am welcoming you to the group who is interested in the farmer. I wish the gentleman had held the same interest when he proposed a tax on every American farm, and when he opposed—

Mr. EBERHARTER. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And when he proposed slaughtering quotas and beef rollbacks.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I refuse to yield. The gentleman has made a misstatement and everybody on the floor knows it. He has become accustomed to doing things like that whenever some speaker has not yielded to him. I do not think that is acting in a way that a Member of the House should act or should treat another Member of the House who is trying to do his duty as he sees it, who is making an argument on what he thinks are the merits of the case.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not want to hurt the feelings of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I understood the gentleman to say that this would only hurt a few people.

Mr. EBERHARTER. My statement was it would hurt only a comparatively few—it might possibly hurt, temporarily, a few employes, specifically engaged in the manufacture or processing of baler twine. I do not think it would. In the last analysis it would not hurt them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] such time as he may desire.

(Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, my interest in the pending bill stems from a primary concern for the needs of the farming interests in my district who have been confronted with untold difficulties in securing sufficient baler twine to meet their requirements during the recent harvest season. There is also, however, some apprehension on my part that in raising the tariff gate we may do irreparable damage to our own cordage industry which in normal times can meet our domestic needs of baler twine.

The persuasive arguments advanced by the National Grange, the Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives are most compelling and I am particularly impressed by their point that binder twine—used for binding grain crops—has been coming into this country duty-free since 1896 and that baler twine—used for machine baling in the field of hay and straw—being made of the same material should, as a matter of course, be relieved of the 15-percent ad valorem duty it now carries.

Undoubtedly, some of the present shortage has been occasioned by certain users of baler twine acquiring in the early part of the year more than they would require for their normal needs during the 1951 season. Far be it from me to label such purchases as hoarding, especially since they were following the recommendations of many agriculture periodicals and news letters, who predicted that there would be a shortage in this important item. The fact does remain, however, that the present shortage, when we take into account the surplus twine already in the hands of those who will use it next year as well as the evident capacity of our cordage industry, will disappear when the normal factors of production and consumption are given free rein.

It is my intention to vote for this bill since I believe that it is vitally important that every facility be afforded our farmers in stimulating the production of cereal grains so vital to our all-out effort in this uncertain period. I do feel, however, that it will be best to put a limitation on this legislation and lift the tariff on baler twine for a period of not more than 18 months. Surely in that time we will be able to ascertain if imports are necessary to augment our annual domestic twine production, and it will set a time limit on legislation which runs counter the basic belief of those of us in the Congress who have consistently opposed the present Trade Agreements Act, which invites a flood of cheaply-produced foreign goods to the detriment of American labor and industry.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distin-

guished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone agrees that there is and has been an actual and real shortage of baler twine for use in balers over the farm lands of the country throughout the past several months. I repeat, except for that fact I think this bill would not be before us today. I agree with the last speaker who said that it is not the money involved here that is the principal item, and I would like to say that the testimony indicates that somewhere between \$5,000,000 and \$6,500,000 would be the expected savings, or the hoped-for savings, that may result if foreign baler twine were freely available in our own market; it was not \$48,000,000, nor was it \$1,000,000; it was somewhere between \$5,000,000 and \$6,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, the real question is whether or not more baler twine will be available to the American farmer for use in his balers next year. So I think that when we look at this bill, if we agree that there cannot be any more baler twine brought in from outside the country, or if we agree that it will be brought in, then the effect of the bill is not going to effectuate the purpose that the farmer wants, namely, more baler twine; and, at the same time, if more is not brought in from outside, the American producer would not be hurt except for one fact. Now, frankly, I do not think a great deal more baler twine is going to be brought in from outside the country; but, I think the American producer is going to be hurt because he may think there is more going to be brought in—and, as a matter of fact, there may be. The American producer will not be able to lay down the requirements with any certainty, which he must do in order to buy the materials used in producing this baler twine, raw materials which must be bought 6 to 7 months ahead of the time it is used. Right now the American cordage industry is endeavoring to ascertain how much material they must have for next year, and they go to the Government largely for the figures upon which they base their estimates as to the amount that should be made for consumption next year. They used all materials last year; and, Mr. Chairman, they produced for use in balers this year far more than the Department of Agriculture and other interested agencies and services told them would be necessary for use in the binders and balers of the country. There was not a great deal more than was estimated, but, unhappily, the American farmer carrying out the recommendations made to him by his great defense agencies, carrying out the policies that were advocated by many organizations that we should buy up the necessary requirements of baler twine for this year, did so; and, as a matter of fact, there is today perhaps 30,000,000 pounds of baler twine held over for consumption next year, but no one knows just how much.

Now, if we pass this proposal and we take off the duty, it is done with the assumption that there will be a lot more baler twine shipped in from outside the limits of the United States. It can come

perhaps from Canada; it can and will come from Mexico. First of all let me say that there is no certainty that the material that is sent in from outside the country will be of the quality which the American farmer will use or can use in his machines, because there is no definition in this bill or anywhere else that suggests what baler twine is. It can and will include a lot of materials under different names, that we call rope or wrapping twine, which come in entirely duty-free because it is called by the producer baler twine. Until there is a proceeding through our courts and a court determination as to just what baler twine is, all a company would have to do on the other side of the water or in Canada would be to ship something in here and say "That is baler twine, boys," and they will not have to pay any duty on it. But by the time the American farmer tries to use that stuff that is shipped in from overseas which is called baler twine he will find out all too frequently that he will not be able to use it in his machines. We ought to protect the American farmer, we ought to make sure that material that is shipped in will be usable in his machines.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the common sense of the American farmer will certainly defend him against buying an inferior product.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That has not been the experience of the past; just because twine is called baler twine is no assurance that it will work in American machines. There has been a great deal of binder twine brought into this country that was not usable by the American farmers; and the farmer can have no protection unless the American courts or the Congress by law specify just what baler twine is.

Mr. DINGELL. As a matter of fact, the gentleman will agree that some of the imported twine has helped to keep up the competitive good quality of American twine?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Perhaps so.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. May I say that there is no assurance that foreign industry will treat this baler twine so that the bugs and so forth will not eat it up after the hay is baled.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Of course not.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The language in the bill, as the gentleman states, is a good deal wider. Here is what it says: "and twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials."

In other words, if this bill is passed you open it up to any kind of twine to be used for any kind of purpose.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that we have been producing rope and twine and everything else of that nature up in my district for 130 years, and they are still buying it.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes. I have another matter which I should like to take up if time permits.

Let us take a look at Mexico. Mexico today is allowed to ship into the United States all the binder twine she wants to and she has not had to pay any duty on it. It is duty free. So what does Mexico do? Does she help the American farmer get binder twine cheaper? No. Mexico imposes an export tax upon every pound of binder twine that goes out of there. The farmer has to pay a duty on it to help the Mexican Government, not the United States. She ships in some baler twine on which she has to pay a duty. She also has an export tax. When that export tax is added to the duty it becomes competitive with our product in this country. As soon as we take the duty off the baled twine you can bet your bottom dollar that Mexico will increase her export tax. She will take that money out of the American farmer's pocket. The price will not drop at all. The Mexican Treasury will get this additional money.

No one testified at all that we would substantially increase the availability of baler twine in this country if we depended upon the foreign producers to do it. I say, let us encourage the American producer and let him realize that this market is largely his, at a reasonable price. By doing that we will best guarantee the American farmer a regular, a continuous and an annual supply to meet his needs.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Here is a point that I think should be brought out in regard to our national defense. I did not see this later letter that was written. I was not accorded the courtesy of a reply. But our Government is stockpiling this sisal. This sisal deteriorates after 3 years, which means then they have to stockpile some more. A question was raised in committee why the Munitions Board did not come up and testify.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not know why they did not. To change their position, as they did, in a very few months, is a very sad commentary upon the Munitions Board.

Over in India they make the burlap which we use in this country. We had a tariff of 1 cent a pound on it. We reduced that tariff recently to one-half cent a pound. Immediately thereafter the Indian Government raised the export tax which they impose for their own benefit by 14 cents a pound, wiping out entirely the savings that were allegedly

going to be given to the American farmer, creating a situation so that as of today you cannot get burlap at a reasonable price.

No, Mr. Chairman, these foreign governments are not going to rush in here to supply the American farmer with goods at any lower price than they can get them here in the regular market. They are going to come over here and take the market, if they can, and once having it—and they will get it—they will do as they have done with burlap—raise the price for all the traffic will bear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are making a great ado about nothing this afternoon. This Congress long ago decided to let binder twine come into this country duty-free.

I believe that this question was settled in 1896, more than half a century ago. Not 10 percent of the membership of this House can look at binder twine or baler twine unless they have them both before them at the same time, and tell which is which. I doubt if there are 10 men who can tell the difference by looking at one type in the absence of the other. There is no difference, except that the baler twine should be a little heavier than the binder twine. Baler twine is nothing in the world except a new development or modification of binder twine. It is used where your bales or bundles are a little heavier than those that were used with the old-fashioned binder.

Now we are not called upon to change any principle at all. We are simply asking by this bill that the Tariff Commission carry out the principle established by the Congress a long time ago. In 1896 the Congress decided that binder twine should come in without paying any tariff. No one was hurt by that action. We are now only asking that we should remove the idiotic technicalities that deny to the American farmer the opportunity to buy in a free market. That is what Congress intended he should, if he has the cash to do it. This is not establishing anything new. All in the world this bill is asking you to do is to place a reasonable interpretation on the policy of the Congress as established more than 50 years ago. Nobody has been destroyed because we allowed binder twine to come into this country, and nobody is going to be destroyed if we allow baler twine to come into this country duty-free.

On the other hand, if our farmers are denied the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of technical advancement and to use the most modern machines, then we are going to destroy productive ability. The question is solely: Are you willing to allow this country to enjoy the advancement that science has given us and allow us to use the most efficient machinery, or are you going to fill the way with legislative stumbling blocks? For my part, I believe in a free economy. I believe in giving our farmers the right to produce whatever they can. I believe in progress. Those who ask for a tariff

on the twine for modern machines and ask for an exemption for the twine used in the old-fashioned machines are, as I see it, standing in the way of progress. I shall vote for this bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, it has been inferred here by many that perhaps the ones who are speaking for or against this bill are representing special interests. If representing the people of my district means representing special interests, I am guilty because I represent what I believe is the wish of the small farmer in my district. While I was home during this short vacation that we had I talked to several small farmers about the binder-twine and the baler-twine situation. Everyone that I talked to was in favor of doing something about it, and they thought that Congress was the place where it should be done. They did not tell me what to do or what should be done or anything like that, but it is evident that something has to be done. One farmer, for instance, told me that in 1946 he paid \$8 for a 40-pound roll of baler twine; in 1949 he paid \$12 and in 1951 he paid \$20, and he could not understand why. Now I do not understand the whole complexity of it. I am not on the committee, but I am representing my people. The farm organizations and the small farmers are in favor of this bill, also the Department of Agriculture is in favor of it. Now I just wonder who is against it. Is it just individuals, men who are representing certain groups, or not? I have heard the statements that have been made here today and I have tried to figure out exactly who is against it. I presume that the cordage people are against it, which is normal. We are against everything that affects us adversely. But, we, as Representatives, are here to do the most good for the majority of the people of this country, regardless of whom it affects. I think that is the way of a democratic government, and it is my duty as a Congressman not to serve special interests. My theory of democratic government is to do justice to the greatest number of people. We feel, by passing this bill, we are serving the best interest of America.

I heard several arguments made here that prices in the future would go this way or that way if this bill is passed. It is easy for us to assume certain things, but we do not know what is going to come about. Some say it is too late now to help the farmer, that we should put it off until next year. That is not going to solve the problem. The bill is before us now. As I said before, I believe the bill should be passed, for it is a worthwhile bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the question here is not what some special interest wants but what is the right thing to do from the standpoint of the United States and our people. Perhaps special interests have inspired the bill. Perhaps

folks from across have inspired it. But what is the situation in the United States?

The gentleman who just preceded me said that the price of baler twine had gone up to \$40 a ton. Why? I can tell you why. The foreigners raised the price of the sisal, as the result largely of the stockpiling and what the Munitions Board did, by 15 cents a pound. The manufacturers of baler twine in this country raised the price only 9.7 cents as the result thereof. In other words, they absorbed all they dared while still attempting to break even.

What is the situation in the twine business right now? Last year there were used in this country 72,000,000 pounds. The amount that has been sold so far this year is 110,000,000 pounds produced by industry, 7,500,000 pounds produced by prisons, and imports of 8,000,000 pounds. This 125,500,000 pounds is nearly double what was sold last year.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania told you that he understood there had been hoarding, that perhaps 30,000,000 pounds had been hoarded. The estimates of the Department of Agriculture of the requirements for this year were 94,000,000 pounds. The amount sold on the market has been 31,500,000 pounds more than the Department of Agriculture estimated as the requirements. Naturally, with the sale of one-third more than the Department of Agriculture estimated there would be more or less difficulty in getting the material. But what will be the picture, if you take off the duty? It will be just this: If you let these folks from across the water go ahead and cut in here with their cheap labor, they will wipe out the baler twine industry in the United States, and we will be put in a position where we will be dependent entirely upon the foreign producers, and we will not have anything to protect the farmer at all. The farmer has been deceived, at least the farm leaders have been deceived by these foreign promoters about the situation that has been presented.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The statement has been made here that there would be only some thousand people affected by this legislation. The gentleman knows something about this industry. Could he give us any idea of the number that would be affected? I know the number is way beyond the figure of 1,000 that has been given us here, but could the gentleman give us any idea of the number?

Mr. TABER. 1,300 employees would be affected in my home town alone.

Mr. KEATING. That is just one company, is it not?

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and there are 16 companies that produce this commodity according to the information that I have. How many there would be, I do not know exactly. But, there is no doubt in the world but that American industry can take care of this situation, if they are given an estimate by the Department of Agriculture, which will enable them to go ahead and stock-

pile these materials when the opportunity presents itself in the dull season of the year in the winter. There should be no shortage if it can be handled properly and correctly.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill will not be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the year the other body adopted as an amendment to a bill which had been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and which had passed the House, a provision in general accord with the purposes of H. R. 1005. The amendment was offered by a distinguished Member of the other body, who is not a member of the party to which I belong, and who is from the State of Nebraska. We had quite a discussion on the matter in conference when we met with the members of the Senate Committee on Finance who made up the conference committee on the part of the Senate. The House conferees knew nothing about the subject because we had had no opportunity to have hearings or to consider it in executive session. We prevailed upon the Senate conferees to recede from their position in support of the amendment which, I think, had been adopted by the other body, if not unanimously, by a very overwhelming vote, for a promise which we made that we would consider this bill, H. R. 1005, before the present Congress adjourned. As a result of that promise, the Senate did recede.

The Committee on Ways and Means scheduled hearings on the bill; 4 days of hearings were held. We learned a great deal about the subject in the 4 days and during the executive sessions which followed. It was impossible to take the bill up before the recent adjournment of the House because certain Members who were greatly interested in this subject could not be here at that time. It is true that the passage of the bill at this late hour in the year will have no effect whatsoever upon the shortage of baler twine which has faced our farmers up to now. It will not enable them to get any more twine from any outside source in the further harvesting of hay, fodder, and so forth, that still remains to be done this season. But it will be of material benefit to farmers who plant and harvest crops next year. It is for the benefit of the farmers next year that we are recommending the bill to the House today. It would not do any good to suspend this 15-percent ad valorem duty for a year, as has been suggested by my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I had that idea myself originally. I even talked about it in the committee. I felt pretty well convinced that that was the thing for us to do. I discussed the matter with certain representatives of farmer organizations, however, and they told me frankly that they would just as soon not have anything as to have a suspension of this duty for 1 year, or even 18 months as I was suggesting. The diffi-

culty is this: We are getting from abroad now practically all of the baler twine which is available. The mere suspension of this duty will not make available abroad for import into the United States any more baler twine. It will be necessary for facilities abroad to be expanded in order for baler twine in any greater amount to be shipped into the United States. Now those are the facts. Some Members may argue that that is a good reason for not having the legislation, but I believe this is generally understood to be the fact by those familiar with the subject. That is the reason you either oppose the bill or support the bill, one way or the other. You think it will mean additional baler twine in the United States. The only way you can get additional baler twine is to have increased production facilities somewhere in the world from which we can get that baler twine.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The very fact that it will encourage expansion of foreign producers of baling twine, by that same fact it will discourage the expansion of domestic producers of baling twine, and that is one thing I do not want to do.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman brings me right down to the point I had in mind. I agree with the gentleman that it will mean increased expansion of facilities abroad. I do not agree with the gentleman, however, that the increased expansion of facilities to make baler twine abroad will in any way mean reducing facilities for the making of it or precluding any increase in the present facilities for making it in the United States. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] well knows that the definition contained in paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is broad enough and is general enough in its verbiage to include at the present time baler twine on the free list. The gentleman knows that. That is the provision of the Tariff Act which since 1896 has continued binding twine on the free list. Binding twine is made in the United States by these same people who make baler twine and the same people who make rope and cordage, and so forth, but there has been no reduction, as far as I know, in the facilities in the United States for making binding twine just because we have imported some binding twine from Mexico or Canada or some other country. It does not necessarily follow that increased facilities for the production of the item needed in the United States by someone abroad means any restriction in increased production of that same commodity here.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The fact is that binder twine has been on the free list since 1896.

Mr. MILLS. Since 1896. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Yet the domestic producers still have 75 percent of the market.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is my understanding—and this information comes from one of the manufacturers of baler twine—that the reason for the shortage was not the failure to produce sufficient or to produce to capacity in this country—in fact, they could have produced more—but the lack of material; the lack of sisal, which is entirely necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MILLS. It is my understanding that no one really is at fault about this shortage that has occurred. The fact is, however, that there has been a tremendous shortage of baler twine in the United States this year. Every farmer who has been endeavoring to buy it has experienced that fact. This baler twine is something that has come into existence since 1939 and the farmers continue to use more of it each year than they did the year before.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Is it not true that there is not sufficient production capacity?

Mr. MILLS. There is a tremendously increased need for it and we anticipate greater need next year than we have this year. We have certain facilities in the United States that are adapted to the making of hard-fiber goods; it is called the hard-fiber cordage and twine industry. That is the one that makes rope, it makes binder twine, and it makes baler twine. Of course, if all of its facilities could be devoted to the making of baler twine there would be sufficient to satisfy this need, but it is not contemplated that all of those facilities will be devoted to that purpose. We feel, therefore, that this legislation is needed. The farm organizations have urged it upon us. They do not want a mere suspension; they want this put on the free list where it was intended to be, as they say, by the action of Congress in 1896.

The Tariff Act of 1930, and previous acts, recognize the various products of the cordage industry, paragraph 1005 (a) provides for cordage—rope—and paragraph 1005 (b) provides for wrapping or tying twines. Cordage, rope, wrapping, and tying twines are all subject to import duties. Paragraph 1622 provides of all binding twines—agricultural twines—which are exempt from import duties.

Nevertheless, opponents of the legislation contended before our committee that baler twine, used by the farmer in harvesting hay, straw, and other fodder crops is not a binding twine, under paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1930, but is a wrapping twine for commercial use under paragraph 1005 (b) and dutiable under the act, as amended, at the rate of 15 percent ad valorem.

The farm organizations disagree with this view. They point out that it has

been a congressional bipartisan policy of long standing to keep farm supplies and equipment, used by the farmer in his farming operations, on the duty-free list, for the benefit of the people as a whole.

Despite the fact that baler twine conforms specifically to the requirements of paragraph 1622, it is subject to the duty of 15 percent by a ruling of the Commissioner of Customs on October 15, 1945—Geo. Wm. Rueff, Inc., against the United States, Customs Court, New Orleans. This case, heard on November 17, 1948, is still pending, and there is no indication of an early decision. Legislative clarification appears to be the only recourse.

The American farmer is not really asking repeal of any existing legislation. He is merely asking this Congress to implement congressional intent by approving H. R. 1005.

The fact that baler twine is a relatively new product and was not manufactured in 1930, does not in any way preclude it from being classified under paragraph 1622 as a binding twine to bind an agricultural product in harvest operations. The Federal courts have sustained such determination in other instances where the language of the Tariff Act clearly describes an article manufactured after the passage of an act, as is the case here.

Wire bale ties, used for the same purpose as baler twine, enter the United States duty-free as an agricultural necessity. The situation which allows duty-free importation of baling wire and binder twine but discriminates against baler twine, when all three items are used in binding agricultural crops, should be corrected.

These are some of the reasons why a majority of the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means recommends passage of this remedial legislation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia called attention to the fact that he had been home on a vacation and the farmers were asking him why the price of baler twine had gone up. I, too, was home. I may tell him that the reason the price went up is because the foreign countries that produce the fibers from which this twine is made raised the price of the raw material 100 percent. Our companies put up their price 33 percent. I make this statement simply that the gentleman from West Virginia may know why the price of twine went up, in case he wants to know. It went up for no other reason, for the cordage manufacturers of this country would have sold it at the same price if their raw materials had not increased 100 percent.

The gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, told you the whole story when he asked you if someone in Canada was going to fix the price of binder twine in the United States; and that is exactly what will happen if this bill goes through.

The two big companies in my district that make this twine are the Plymouth Cordage Co. and the New Bedford Cordage Co. Both of these companies have been in business for over a hundred years. While I do not think the passage of this bill will drive them out of business, somebody wanted to know what percentage of their business this twine constituted. In the case of the Plymouth Cordage Co. it is 33 percent. As I pointed out before, some 1,300 or 1,400 people work in the Plymouth Cordage Co. Most of them are married and have children, so we may safely assume that there are between 4,000 and 5,000 people in just that one town who will be affected by the passage of this legislation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said this would hurt only a few people. I say that if it hurts anybody we should not pass it. We in this Congress are supposed to be here to help everybody and hurt no one, and this bill absolutely hurts those two industries that have been going for over a hundred years, hurts them immeasurably; I do not know how much; it is not right to cite figures.

I asked the gentleman from Tennessee, whom I greatly admire, how much money this would mean to us. He did not give the exact figures. I thought that the Committee on Ways and Means was here to find some way of meeting the Government expenses, not how to tax somebody else, a privileged thing, and do it under the guise of helping the farmer. Why, he can buy a whole bale of twine for only \$15, and I think he can stand that if he is a regular farmer.

Well, I do not know what we are going to do about this bill, Mr. Chairman, but every time you step in here and try to regulate somebody's business, someone who has been in business 100 years before we were born, who know and come down here and say do not do it, you are doing our country a great harm. Now, why do you do it? Are they engaged in business for selfish reasons? Do they not know how to run their business? I think they do.

It has been stated here that there is a shortage. There is no shortage. The American farmers bought more of this binder twine last year than they ever bought before, based on advice from the Farm Bureau and other farm organizations. They bought it up, and they were in a position to buy it up, and they are in a position to do it now. There are only 10 States in the whole of the Union that bale hay and straw, and whatever they use this twine for.

You do not want to hurt anybody in this country, whether he is a businessman, an employer of labor or an employee. None of us want to do that. But if you want to hand this Government over to England or Canada or any other foreign country, then go ahead and keep passing laws like this, because that is where we will wind up, having some other country pass our laws instead of ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say that I have no cordage plants in my district, but I do have a great number of farmers because my district is an agricultural one. Therefore I certainly want to represent the majority of the people of my district and I try to do that to the best of my ability. So far I seem to have satisfied them.

We have been hearing the pros and cons of this baler-twine controversy and I am just going to summarize what we had in the hearings in committee and perhaps what has been given here on the floor today. I want to summarize them in just four or five short statements, which are statements that give the reasons that I am opposed to this bill.

No. 1: This is permanent legislation to cure a temporary emergency situation. It will not cure that situation. Even the proponents of the bill acknowledge that it will not cure it so far as this season is concerned at least. Let me say that if the proponents of this bill had been willing to accept temporary legislation, this bill would have been passed without any controversy last May or June, in time to have helped the temporary emergency situation that faced some of the farmers of America.

No. 2: The temporary emergency situation which this bill is supposed to cure was created by hoarding on the part of some farmers, encouraged by agricultural groups through their papers and magazines to do that hoarding.

No. 3: The legislation, of course, cannot possibly relieve the emergency situation that has confronted the farmer during this season and all shortages can and will be taken up by our own manufacturers of cordage before another season rolls around. They produced this year 50 percent more baling twine than our Agricultural Department said would be needed; they produced that much this year, and they could have produced 100 percent more if they thought it would have been used.

No. 4: This legislation will result in injury to our own cordage industry and tend to make us dependent upon foreign cordage producers. Is that what we want? Do we want to expand the foreign cordage producers at the expense of our own?

No. 5: It is against the interests of national defense and is opposed by our Munitions Board, although the Chairman of the Munitions Board comes in at the last minute and repudiates what the Munitions Board itself has said.

No. 6: The American farmer in the long run, in my opinion, will be adversely affected by the passage of this bill, because it will tend to place him at the mercy of foreign producers of baler twine.

For that reason and the others named, I am opposing this bill and doing it, in my opinion, for the benefit of the farmers.

(Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the reason I am taking this time is to ask a question of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. He did not answer the question I directed to him. It is my understanding that the shortage of baler twine that we experienced throughout the country and are experiencing presently was not the result of lack of capacity of American industry to produce the necessary baler twine but because we could not get the raw materials into the country. If that is so, and I believe it is, and I would like to stand corrected if it is not true, we are really talking about the importation of raw materials. As I understand, the reason that we could not get the necessary sisal, for example, into the country to take care of this baler-twine shortage was the fact that we were stockpiling it, and our own companies were unable to obtain it. If that is the problem, then I submit that our question is not one of eliminating, adding to or in any way interfering with the existing protective tariff on this particular item. It is a question of obtaining the raw materials.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The raw materials were received, they were produced, and a 50-percent increase in production this year over last year.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; and it is my understanding that we will produce fully in 1952 so that there should be no shortage.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I consider the bill now under consideration one of the most important and one of the most meritorious bills that has been reported by our committee since I have enjoyed membership on the committee.

From what we have heard today from those who oppose the legislation one would think that this bill would establish a new policy as far as tariff matters are concerned. It has been my understanding, and if I am mistaken someone will please correct me, that it has been the traditional tariff policy not only of the Democratic Party but of the Republican Party to provide for the importation free of duty of farm supplies, farm implements, and farm machinery. So if that is the case, this bill certainly establishes no new policy, and makes no change in the traditional policy of the two parties with respect to the tariff as it affects agriculture.

For the gentleman from New York, my good friend [Mr. REED], the ranking minority member of our committee, and a very able, diligent, and conscientious member of the committee, I have a very high regard and personal affection for his many courtesies and kindnesses to me. But I think it could truthfully be said of him that he is the watchman on the tower for the high protective tariff policy. I do not believe that Smoot in his day or Hawley in his day or Payne

In his day, the leaders for the high protection policy, had anything on my good friend as far as his ardent, conscientious belief that a high protective tariff benefits the American people as a whole is concerned. I do not question that.

We had elaborate hearings on this bill. There are 117 pages of published hearings. As much as you have heard today about the opposition and as severely as the bill has been criticized, the testimony of only three persons appears in these 117 pages of hearings in opposition to this bill. One was the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. TABER; another was Mr. Edwin G. Roos, vice president of the Plymouth Cordage Co. and chairman of the tariff committee of the Cordage Institute; and the third was Mr. James W. Curran, vice president of the American Prison Association.

If the interests of labor and industry—and as they claim, the interests of the American farmer—were so seriously threatened, surely more witnesses would have appeared in opposition to this legislation than did appear. You might think that more Members of this House representing great agricultural districts would have appeared and said that this bill threatens the welfare of the constituents whom they represent. Yet we experienced nothing of the kind.

On the other hand, who appeared in favor of this bill and advocated this legislation? In the first place, Hon. HUGH BUTLER, United States Senator from the State of Nebraska, a great agricultural State as well as an industrial State. He is supposed to know how this bill would affect the agricultural interests of his State just as Members of Congress from other agricultural States would know how this bill would affect their States. He appeared and testified very earnestly in favor of this bill—without amendments—mark you. He appeared in favor of the bill as is. Then, there was the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. STEFAN], who, as all know, is a distinguished Member of this body. He appeared and testified earnestly in favor of this legislation. Also the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], a member of the minority in this body, representing a great agricultural State. He appeared and strongly advocated the passage of this bill.

Who else appeared in favor of it? The heads of the four great farm organizations in this country. You heard it said by, I think, the distinguished gentleman from New York that the agricultural leaders of this country, the farm organizations and the farmers themselves, have been misled. I would hate to say that I, a farmer, myself, engaged in farming all my life until I came to the Congress, know more about how this or any other legislation that would affect agriculture than the farmers themselves who day in and day out shed their sweat while they toil in their fields. The distinguished gentleman from New York is a lawyer, and I do not believe that any lawyer from New York or anywhere else can in all sincerity say that he knows better how any legislation relating to

agriculture will affect that great calling, as against the farmers themselves and the farm organizations that study the farm problems day in and day out, and night in and night out, the year round. My friends, that is a great deal to assume. It is a great deal for any Member of this House to take upon himself to say that he knows more about how to represent the farmers, and how this legislation would affect the farmers and the farming industry, than the farmers themselves and the heads of the great farm organizations.

They appeared, as has been said today, unanimously in favor of this legislation. The Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Farmers Union appeared in favor of this legislation. All with one mind and with one voice and with one accord, without the suggestion of any amendments and without any fear of the serious effect upon the welfare of the farmers or labor, or the general well-being of the people of the country. It is astounding to say that they do not know and understand this problem well enough, and that they have been deceived or are trying to deceive our committee, and deceive the Members of Congress. It was unquestionably proved, and there was indisputable evidence brought out before our committee, that there is an actual shortage of baler twine.

Will someone in this House, who is opposed to this bill, tell me that binder twine which has been on the free list and kept there throughout the different administrations, during the time that the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was written, and when the Payne-Aldrich tariff was in effect, and the Fordney-McCumber bill was in effect, has resulted in the destruction of that industry? What is the difference between baler twine and binder twine, which are used by the farmers for practically the same purpose, as everyone knows? All the dire predictions that have been made as to how this bill will adversely affect and cripple the farmers, and put the cordage industry out of business, have not turned out to be true so far as binder twine is concerned. If the free importation of baler twine would destroy the baler twine industry, why has not the free importation of binder twine destroyed the binder twine industry. Will someone rise and tell me that? They are in the same category. They serve the same purpose.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the distinguished and able gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. It is because the combines have knocked out the binder twine, and there is not any, to speak of, any more. There is not any substantial amount.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the gentleman is satisfied with his address today, that the farm organizations have been deceived and that he knows more about

how this will affect them than they know themselves, I am satisfied to leave it as it is without any further argument.

Mr. Chairman, from the debate thus far on the bill to provide for the free importation of baler twine, I believe that the following issues have been developed:

First, is there in fact a shortage of baler twine available to the American farmer at this time and in the foreseeable future?

Second, would the repeal of the 15 percent tariff now in effect on baler twine increase the available supply of baler twine?

Third, is there any basis for distinguishing between binder twine, baling wire and other farm supplies already on the free list, and baler twine?

Fourth, would repeal of the tariff on baler twine jeopardize either the national security or the proper interests of the domestic industry?

A. ACUTE SHORTAGE OF BALER TWINE

The unchallenged testimony of witnesses representing farmers and farm organizations before the Committee on Ways and Means is that farmers in many areas throughout the country have been unable to obtain a sufficient quantity of baler twine to harvest their crops of hay and straw. As a result, hay has been rotting in the fields. The limited supplies of baler twine that have been available are selling for exorbitant prices, which many farmers have paid rather than lose their crops.

It is, of course, true that the demand for baler twine has been increasing because a growing number of farmers have demonstrated a preference for baler twine over baling wire. It has been pointed out that domestic manufacturers of baler twine have been producing during the current year at a higher rate than heretofore, yet they have not been able to meet the demand. This is not a localized problem. Hay is grown in all parts of the United States and I can say that seldom have the farmers of all sections of the country united so solidly in support of any legislation pending before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Farmers have been urged to expand their production for the defense program and it is unthinkable to me that the Congress would allow any obstacle to interfere with the harvesting of the crops after the farmer has worked hard to raise them.

I say to my friends who have presented these statistics on higher production of baler twine that I would like to see them reciting those figures to a farmer who lost his hay crop because of his inability to obtain baler twine. This shortage is real and we need all the baler twine that we can get, whether produced in the United States or anywhere else.

B. REPEAL OF THE TARIFF WOULD INCREASE SUPPLIES OF BALER TWINE

Actually, there would seem to be little basis for argument on this point. The four national farm organizations—the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union and the American Farm Bureau Federation—all are convinced that repeal of the tariff will increase the

supply of baler twine available to the farmer. If repeal of the tariff would not increase imports of baler twine, it is difficult to see why the opponents of this legislation who speak for the American manufacturers of baler twine are complaining.

By enabling foreign producers to profitably export to the United States, this legislation would help to reduce the high prices currently paid by the farmers for domestic twine as well.

According to evidence presented at the hearings by the spokesman for the American Farm Bureau Federation, the price of baler twine has sharply increased during the past 2 years. In fact, earlier this year farmers purchased twine for about \$11 per 40-pound bale. The quoted price for delivery in September was \$18.50, although there have been some reports of twine being offered for \$25 per 40-pound bale. How can the opponents of this legislation contend that the supply situation of the American farmer would not be improved in the face of these facts?

As well stated by the representative of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives before the Committee on Ways and Means:

Another argument of the opponents to this proposed legislation is that the saving in the cost to the farmer of his baler twine would be negligible if the 15-percent duty were removed. This is not borne out by the facts. As one example, the United States domestic net cash carload price is 5.24 cents per pound higher than the domestic price in Canada, where a comparable quality of baler twine is produced. (United States price, 34.67 cents per pound; Canadian price, 29.43 cents per pound. Both prices are in United States currency.) With 125,000,000 pounds estimated to be used by the American farmer in 1951, it can be seen that \$6,550,000 is represented by a 5.24-cents per pound higher price. We do not regard this as a negligible amount of money. This money belongs to the American farmer and food-consuming public.

C. THERE IS NO BASIS FOR DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN BINDER TWINE AND BALING WIRE, AND BALER TWINE

This bill will place baler twine on the same duty-free status as binder twine and baling wire. This is in accord with the established policy of Congress to admit agricultural commodities and implements free of duty. How can anyone seriously contend that binder twine and baler twine, which are both made from the same fibers, should receive different treatment under the tariff laws? If baler twine had been in use in 1930 when the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was enacted, there is little doubt in my mind that even the authors of that law would have placed baler twine on the free list just the same as they did binder twine and baling wire, which are used for the same general purposes.

D. REPEAL OF THE TARIFF WOULD NOT IMPAIR THE STOCKPILING PROGRAM FOR DEFENSE OR SERIOUSLY AFFECT THE INTERESTS OF THE DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

It has been urged in opposition to the bill that repeal of the tariff would interfere with the Government stockpiling program. The argument is that the stockpile of imported fibers must be rotated and that domestic producers of

baler twine would not be able to use as much as they have in the past. There are two answers to this argument. First, there is nothing to indicate that domestic manufacturers will not still be able to produce at a reasonable profit a substantial proportion of the expanding requirements of American farmers for baler twine, or to keep them from continuing to utilize the older fibers held in the defense stockpile. Moreover, it is understood that foreign producers of baler twine have been asked to share in the rotation of the stockpile maintained in this country.

I believe that the letter received by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] from the Chairman of the Munitions Board answers any contention that this bill would threaten the defense program.

In conclusion, I want to say just a word about the amendments that have been suggested. The minority report proposes that there should be merely a temporary suspension of the duty instead of complete repeal. Of course, the opponents of this legislation know that foreign manufacturers cannot afford to convert their facilities to substantially greater production of baler twine on just a temporary basis. Nor can American farmers afford to buy expensive hay balers unless they have the assurance that there will be an adequate supply of baler twine to enable them to use this method of harvesting their hay crops.

On this point it seems to me that the farmer organizations—those who really speak for the farmer—are in the best position to know what is best for him, and it is their view that a temporary suspension of the duty on baler twine would merely serve to perpetuate the present undesirable situation. It is their belief that no action would be preferable to creating the temporary illusion that the farmers' needs were being met.

Then, the other proposition that a set of elaborate restrictions on the kind of baler twine that would be admitted free of duty comes from a unique source indeed. The domestic manufacturers who are opposed to this legislation suggest a set of elaborate limitations upon the imports of baler twine that shall be entitled to free entry. They say that this is in the best interest of the American farmer; that it will protect him against inferior quality of merchandise. This looks to me like the Greeks bearing gifts and I doubt whether the American manufacturers are really interested in the welfare of the American farmer to that extent. Moreover it appears to me that the farmer will be able to protect himself against inferior imported merchandise fully as well as he has been able to detect inferior-quality products in other lines. I do not believe the American farmer needs the solicitude of the domestic producers of baler twine in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, the shortage of baler twine is acute. The need for this legislation is immediate and this House should not delay the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has expired.

(Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "binding twine" a comma and the words "and twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "materials," and insert "materials."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I do not expect to use 5 minutes, but I would like to ask a question or two of the proponents of this legislation.

I would like to ask whether if this bill is passed there is any assurance that the farmers will get more baling and binder twine. I do not care particularly who answers the question.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. That is the testimony of the farmers themselves and the farm organizations before the committee. That was the whole purpose of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman himself believe that the farmers will get more twine?

Mr. COOPER. I certainly do, and that is the reason I am supporting the bill.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask another question: Will that mean a lower price for baling and binder twine?

Mr. COOPER. The farmers seem to think so, and I agree with them.

Mr. GROSS. You agree with them.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I well remember, Mr. Chairman, that about a year ago we had a very acute situation with respect to baling wire. This year there are no reports, from my district at least, of a scarcity of baling wire. I am wondering whether we cannot work out this situation on the same basis.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman had read the testimony of the farmers, they do not like baling wire, whether it is available or not. They prefer baler twine. It is safer. It is better. It is easier to handle.

Mr. GROSS. I do not agree with the gentleman that baling twine is particularly safer; the gentleman well knows that there a great number of hay balers in the country that use wire.

Mr. DINGELL. The farmers, however, believe that wire-bound hay or feed fed to cattle is dangerous, and when used as bedding for cattle is also dangerous in that it might cause hide punctures and gangrene.

Mr. GROSS. But, of course, the farmer will always remove the wire

rather than leave it in the stall or feed rack.

Mr. DINGELL. He does not always remove it, but it is always more difficult to remove; you have to cut it with clip-pers or pliers, whereas you can just take the twine-bound bale and hit the twine with a shovel or cut it with a knife and leave it right there, because it is an agricultural product in itself.

Mr. GROSS. I understand all of that perfectly because I have baled some hay in my time with baling wire.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sorry I cannot admit to having baled hay or anything else, but I will say again that I am taking the word of the farmer. Do you challenge it?

Mr. GROSS. Challenge the word of the farmer as to what?

Mr. DINGELL. As to the desirability and preference for using baling twine instead of wire.

Mr. GROSS. No; not at all.

Mr. DINGELL. That is what I am going on; I am taking the word of experts, of the farmers themselves.

Mr. GROSS. But I am pointing out that the situation with respect to the shortage of baling wire seems to have been cured in a rather short period of time, and I am wondering if under the existing system of production the baling twine situation will not be cured likewise.

Mr. DINGELL. I hope it is, but they cannot use baling wire in balers that use twine.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I speak from personal knowledge and from talking with farmers who produce hay as a pay crop. They greatly prefer to use balers that use baler twine rather than those that use binder twine and they will not buy a baler that uses binder twine if they can possibly get one that uses baler twine.

Mr. GROSS. I suggest to the chairman that the man who has a twine baler is glad to have twine, and the man who has a wire baler is glad to have wire.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The use of baler twine has increased far beyond the capacity of the manufacturers to supply it. Production has nothing like overtaken the great demand, and there is a shortage, a great shortage in baler twine over the country.

The farmers are disturbed, too, because the price of baler twine has increased from \$11 for a 40-pound bale to \$18.50; and, further, the price of baler twine in Canada is 5 cents less per pound than the price in the United States, but the great necessity for this bill is because the American farmer prefers to use the baler that uses twine.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and do so only to state for the benefit of the gentleman from Iowa that in my remarks I pointed out that the difference between a baling machine

using baler twine and one using wire is a big one in the saving of manpower. I said one man can operate an automatic pick-up baling machine which uses baling twine whereas it takes two to four men to operate an automatic pick-up baling machine which uses wire. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that a man who has a baler which uses wire is pretty glad to get rid of his wire baler and get one that uses baler twine, provided he can be assured of a sufficiency of twine. That is exactly what we are trying to do for him now.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I think you can clear up the question of the use of wire as a dangerous instrumentality in the handling of livestock; it is. The danger comes in the loss of livestock.

Mr. DINGELL. And the gentleman is a dirt farmer, I take it. I have seen him with mud on his boots right here in Washington.

Mr. BURDICK. We have had many cases of a cow dying and the post mortem showed that she had two or three of these wires all balled up in her stomach. That does not happen with twine.

Mr. DINGELL. A dead cow does not produce milk either.

Mr. BURDICK. You can feed them on twine if you have salt enough.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman that the farmers would like to have twine balers, but I still have no assurance from members of the committee that if we pass this bill twine is going to be any cheaper or there will be any more of it.

Mr. DINGELL. At least we are heading in that direction. I would not swear to my friend that there is going to be an amount of baler twine sufficient to cover all needs forever and ever, but I do say that this move is in that direction. I am playing into the hands of the farmer in this instance, he wants this bill enacted, and I would like to ask my friend, who professes to be a friend of the farmer, to join me.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did some farm organization put this bill in?

Mr. DINGELL. Originally, as the gentleman should know by now because it has been covered by several Members, the bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. It was attached to two different bills which we sent over to the Senate and which they passed over in the Senate. We had to take them up in conference and we decided we ought to have full and complete hearings and give everybody a chance to be heard. Having heard the testimony, and the preponderance of evidence being on the side of the farm spokesmen, the

bill was reported by the committee without any of the amendments which you intend to offer here this afternoon. All of those amendments have been passed on and rejected in committee. If you do offer them you are going to have a roll call on each one of them.

Mr. NICHOLSON. As I sat here listening to the debate all day, this apparently is a farmer's bill, yet nowhere in its progress through the Congress has any farm organization sponsored it.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is just as wrong as he can be. Let him take a look at the hearings on the bill. It is the farmers who have given their strongest support to this bill. The gentleman better get caught up on himself before he makes remarks of that kind, because this is the first time I remember or that any other Member on this floor remembers, and I have been here nearly 20 years, that the four farm organizations have gotten together behind one bill. They are unanimously in support of this one.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman cannot offer any better argument than that, he better cover up.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I will cover up by saying that the CIO and the AFL have gone on record against this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. The national organizations have nothing to say about it. A local union maybe did.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did Mr. Edelman appear before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. DINGELL. He did not appear before the committee. He was conspicuously absent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring out the point that this baler-twine industry developed about 1939. It is a new industry. It was developed by our people and our industries took it up and started in to see if they could not serve the farmers better with this baler twine. They got well organized and they have gone into great research on this baler twine particularly, of course, so far as vermin are concerned, the danger being that if it is of an inferior quality and is not protected by proper chemical treatment, if they bale the hay and put it in the barn, then the rats and mice gnaw through the twine and the hay is lost. It is all mixed up and has to be reprocessed again before they can really ship it out. Now they are established and they have rendered a wonderful service over the years to the farmers of this country, and with the aid of the Department of Agriculture they made careful surveys, and they produced much more than the surveys indicated they would need this year. The testimony shows that, and there is no dispute about it. Now then they come along, and here is a man, Hogate, who registers as a lobbyist shortly after this bill is introduced. He is representing a foreign mill in Ontario, Canada,

close to Detroit. That is the port of entry. This man is being paid \$1,000 a month, as shown by the Lobby Register, and he has been carrying on this propaganda. It has been a fight from the start. He is working on the farm leaders. The farmers have been misled by this lobbyist. Now you turn this foreign industry loose on our baler industry that has given good service to the farmers. This bill if passed will reduce our revenue. It will destroy the business here, and as has been said time and time again, your price of baler twine will go up and your farmers will not get an adequate supply of baler twine. They will have to pay the price asked by these foreign producers. Mr. Hogate has done a magnificent job for those people who want to take over our market, the very heart and security of the United States. Foreign interests could well afford to pay Mr. Hogate a million dollars a year. He is a great man, apparently; he has great prestige, and I also think that he selected the right people to work for him.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little afraid that some of the future benefits which would result from the passage of this bill as outlined by the proponents are probably a little farfetched and I think that some of the dire consequences as outlined by the opponents are a little extreme. In the first instance I think we have to remember that binder twine, which was the general material used in the binding and harvesting of crops, has been on the free list from 1896 to date. The cordage industry is the industry that manufactures binder twine. That industry has continued to exist in the United States in spite of the free importation of binder twine. We have a shortage today in the item of baler twine which for all intents and purposes has become a substitute for binder twine.

A little example of what has actually happened can probably be seen by the poundage manufactured of binder twine and baler twine in the last few years. In about 1939 baler twine first came into existence, and it really did not come into very much usage until the early forties. It came in in connection with a shift from balers using twine instead of wire and also as a result of the increased use of combines or harvester-threshers. This change in the agricultural method of harvesting came into great prominence in the forties and has continued since that time. In about 1927 twine that was used, the cordage that was made for the purpose of binding, was binder twine, and at that time about 227,000,000 pounds was produced. That was at the height of the binder twine usage. Yet that shrank so that in 1947 there was only about 90,000,000 pounds of binder twine produced. In other words, there was a conversion. The farmers were getting away from the old method of using binder twine and wire and instead were going into the system of baling, which required a heavier type of twine.

You can see this conversion when you take the production figures for baler

twine, which in 1939 were practically zero, and yet in 1951 were in excess of 125,000,000 pounds.

Actually what has happened is that instead of using binder twine generally you are using baler twine. Your cordage industry existed when the usage was in the field of binder twine and binder twine was on the free list. It did not ruin the cordage industry of the country and it is not ruined today. The use of baler twine did not give rise to a new industry, it gave rise only to a new process, a new conversion within an existing industry, the cordage industry. The farmer has been changing over from the use of binder twine to baler twine. The manufacturer has been changing over from binder twine to baler twine.

I do not think the passage of this bill is going to ruin the cordage industry. I think the evidence of what happened to the industry with binder twine on the free list should be evidence of that fact.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has just stated that the development of the baling twine has been within recent years and has occurred since we have had any legislative revision of the Tariff Act. Does not the gentleman think that if this development of baling twine had come about before the Smoot-Hawley Act was passed in 1930 baling twine would have been placed on the free list just the same as binding twine was placed on the free list?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will read the wording of the Tariff Act of 1930 he will find that it does not say "binder twine," it says "binding twine." I think basically what they had in mind was any material which was used by the farmer in the harvesting and in the binding of his crops in the process of harvesting.

The point I have been trying to make is that I do not see any of the dire consequences that are pictured by some in the cordage industry as the result of the possible passage of this legislation. On the other hand, I cannot see the great benefits which some of the proponents seem to see in the future as the result of the passage of the legislation.

It was a peculiar thing that in the hearings before our committee none of the witnesses could put their finger on the exact cause of today's shortage. Nobody would admit that the shortage today was as the result of the present duty. This is understandable because with an extreme shortage the farmers were willing to buy and did buy every bit of baler twine they could possibly get, and every foreigner that could ship in here did ship in here in spite of the duty. As far as this year's supply of baler twine was concerned, we had just as much as we would have gotten if the duty had been removed earlier in the year.

There is some feeling that the removal of this barrier might encourage a little increase outside the country in baler-twine production, but I do not think this is going to end forever all the

farmers' worries. There is more to the shortage of baler twine than just the matter of this duty. I would hate to have the farmers of the country think that when this bill becomes law, from then on they are going to have baler twine to burn, and that there will be no more problems, because this legislation will not solve it completely. The witnesses before the committee could not put their finger on exactly what all the causes were or what the basic difficulties were.

My reason for favoring this bill is very simple. In my judgment, it is necessary in order to be consistent in the tariff policy which we have followed for years as far as twine used for binding the products of the farmer is concerned. Just because the farmer has changed over to a slightly different item for binding his products, I do not think it should change the basic status in our tariff law of that item or of the items used. It has been our basic tariff policy to exempt from duty any of the items used by the farmers in producing the food and fiber needed by this country. In my judgment, baler twine should enjoy this exemption. I believe that was the intent of the act of 1930. I think what we are doing here by this bill is to carry out the intention of that act, and that all we are doing is continuing the status quo so far as the cordage industry and the treatment of binding twine is concerned.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. In accordance with your views as to the prospect that neither the cordage industry nor the farmers would be benefited or hurt, do you not believe it would be well to put this out as a trial balloon and limit the period of time in which this act would be effective so we would not be throwing American employees out of work? I think we are going too far.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wish the gentleman would not present an argument. I yielded to him to ask a question. I do not think you are going to hurt the cordage industry, as I tried to explain, because they were not particularly hurt by the free importation of binder twine. Personally, I do not think it would be consistent with our historic tariff policy to limit the effectiveness of the bill to 18 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill. I am not sure, as the gentleman who has preceded me has said, whether this is going to solve all the ills. I do happen to know from my own personal knowledge and experience in my district that this baler twine situation is very, very bad not only as regards to scarcity of the commodity, but as regards to exorbitant prices. I happened to have had in my hand the last couple of days two bills of a man who had bought baler twine this year. When he bought in May, he paid \$11 and something a bale. When he bought here last week, he had to pay \$18 a bale for it. I do not know

that this bill is going to answer his problems, but it is the only thing we have before us. Aside from that, this is an absurd situation when you examine the physical aspect of the products that you propose to impose a tariff on. If I had two pieces of this product in my hand—if I had a piece of baler twine and a piece of binder twine, at the distance that you gentlemen are sitting from me, you could not tell the difference between them. My colleague has handed me a sample card with two pieces of baler and binder twine on it. As you can see, there is no apparent difference between them. There is no difference in efficacies and binding qualities of these two products except that one has a few more strands of exactly the same material in it than the other has. Yet, you say, you are going to let one in duty-free, and on the other, baler twine, you are going to impose a tariff. It just does not make sense. Let us take the practical situation from the standpoint of the farmers. I happen to have two neighbors adjoining my farm. One of them has one type of baler. He bales in square bales, and he uses the regular, what we call the baler twine. So he must pay a tariff on his twine. Right over the fence from him, is another neighbor and he uses another type of baler. That baler bales a round bale. So, according to the mechanism of the two machines, the man who makes the square bale uses the twine that is subject to a tariff, and the man over the fence from him who uses the round type of baler uses the regular binder type of twine, which is a smaller twine, and he pays no tariff on it. So there you have a situation of one man on one side of the fence baling clover hay, and the other man on the other side baling the exact same kind of clover hay at the same time and for the same purpose, and one of them pays a tariff and the other does not pay a tariff on exactly the same product. Is it not ridiculous? Do we want to leave ourselves in such an absurd position, aside from the merits of the case and whether it is going to save the farmers some money? That is exactly the position you are in today. Put them both on the same basis—either both tax-free or both subject to a tariff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for those who are opposing this legislation, but, frankly, it seems to me they are making a mountain out of a molehill, in their dire predictions as to what will happen to American cordage manufacturers if this legislation is passed.

I feel very much as does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] that this may not make a great deal of difference in the supply of twine, but I think it is a sound principle to say that if you are trying to increase the supply of a product you ought to remove

whatever impediments there are to its distribution. If the duty is keeping out baler twine, then the removal of that duty will certainly increase the available supply.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I will yield to my distinguished friend later if I have time.

It has been said previously, and I want to repeat it as a Republican, that the traditional policy of the Republican Party in this country has been to permit importation, duty free, of all of the articles that go into the production of farm products. That was the policy under the Fordney-McCumber bill, under the Smoot-Hawley bill, and I understand all previous bills. I do not want the word to go out today to the farmers of this country that the Republicans in Congress are repudiating the policy which we have always followed of admitting, duty free, those articles which go into the production of farm products. It was a sound policy when it was adopted and it is still a sound policy. For that reason, if for no other, it seems to me that we Republicans are making a great mistake if we defeat the legislation which is now before us.

I have not the slightest doubt but what if baling twine had been in use at the time the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was passed in 1930, it would have been placed in the free list, along with every other article that is used in farm production. I am sure that at the time the Smoot-Hawley bill was passed it was contemplated and intended by those who wrote the legislation that the provision which permitted binding twine to come in free would include anything that was used to bind or contain farm products in the harvest fields. Why should we at this time take a position which is at entire variance with the policy of both parties in this country in the past?

Every one of the general farm organizations of this country—and it is the first time I can recall for some time that all of them have been together—have appeared before the committee in support of the bill. They have taken the position that this legislation will bring about a greater supply of baling twine. I do not pretend to know just how much of a change it will make, but certainly if it makes any change at all it will be in the direction of a greater supply. I am anxious that we should follow the policy that has always been followed in matters of this kind and that we open the way here to increase the supply to whatever extent it may be brought about. For that reason I am supporting the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not true that during all the time the Republicans were in power from the 1890's down until sometime early in the thirties that they always were in favor of no tariff on machinery that was used on the farm?

Mr. HOPE. I am speaking just of my personal knowledge; I know that was true under the Fordney-McCumber Act and under the Smoot-Hawley bill, and my understanding is that it was true as far as previously Republican-sponsored tariff bills were concerned.

Mr. SPRINGER. And that was true even as to hay balers.

Mr. HOPE. It was true of all farm machinery and all supplies that went into production of farm crops.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it to the committee amendment?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Right after the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. We have pending the committee amendment in line 7 to substitute a comma for the period.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will offer my amendment to the committee amendment, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 1, line 7, insert a new section as follows:

"The National Production Authority shall take all steps possible to allocate from domestic supplies enough baling twine to meet the needs of American farmers not only for the 1951 purpose but for all subsequent emergencies."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will not the gentleman permit me to be heard on my amendment before he presses the point of order?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the pending bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will dispose of the point of order first unless the gentleman from New York concedes it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No; I do not concede it; I want to be heard on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman wishes to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The gentleman from New York will present any point of view he has on that question.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this apparently is a gag rule when one tries to present an amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not a discussion of the point of order.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am endeavoring to get to the discussion of the point of order if the gentleman will allow me to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will address his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, we are here to try to get baling twine for the farmers of the country; we are here just about 3 months too late. The amendment I just presented was H. R. 4479 which I introduced on June 5, 1951. If my amendment had prevailed or had been voted upon, we would have had the opportunity to perfect the machinery here on the House floor so that we could get baling twine from domestic sources. So I believe this amendment should be submitted to a vote since it is an honest effort to accomplish the objective which we are all here to try to accomplish.

The National Production Authority is the agency which the Congress has set up for obtaining these various allocations. There is no reason in the world why the National Production Authority should be ruled out of the consideration of this bill, and it seems to me that in presenting an amendment of this kind, the House ought to have an opportunity to vote upon it. If this is an emergency we certainly ought to face it; we ought not to let any possible opportunity slip by even though in upstate New York a bill of this kind is just 3 months too late. We should have passed a bill providing for baling twine 3 months ago in order that the farmers of up-State New York might have had a chance to have enough baling twine to get in their hay crop. In North Carolina and other southern States where the jungle growth is much more advanced than it is up in up-State New York, they have three crops of hay. They are harvesting their last crop down there now. We harvested our hay crop from June 15 to August 1 and we are out of luck as far as getting this twine is concerned.

In other words, this is an honest effort on my part to attempt to get this bunch of bureaucrats down in the National Production Authority off of their plush cushions and get them busy to try to obtain some of the allocation of this twine from our domestic supply. My bill was the first and one of the few attempts to obtain baling twine for the farmers of this country.

The Hall bill would have accomplished what this bill comes too late to do, namely, remedy the present emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York offers an amendment that has for its purpose apparently an increase in the domestic supply of baling twine. The pending legislation is an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930. It appears from an examination of the gentleman's amendment that it goes far beyond the scope of the bill, in that it applies to different legislation; therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: Strike out of H. R. 1005 all matter after the enacting clause, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That after paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended, insert the following new paragraph:

"1622 (a). Baler twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle, or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn or a mixture of any two or more of them, single ply, and measuring not exceeding 240 feet to the pound, containing not less than 8 percent of oil by weight, mildew proofed, treated to repel insects and rodents and chiefly used in an automatic pick-up baler in the baling of hay, straw, and fodder."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. As I caught the reading of it, the amendment seeks to change an entirely different provision of existing law than that sought to be changed by the pending bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I can think of nothing that could be more important to this bill than to define what baler twine is. That is what my amendment does and that is all it does.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. We disposed of all of these amendments that the gentleman proposes to bring up here in committee. We voted on them and they were voted adversely.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, upon further inquiry my understanding is that the amendment seeks to amend the same paragraph of the Tariff Act as the pending bill seeks to amend?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have been struck all afternoon by the fact that no one seems to know what baler twine is. That is, under this provision other countries would be permitted to ship baler twine into this country and they could ship in most anything, calling it baler twine, and it would come in without the payment of duty.

Now, certain countries have been shipping inferior binder twine in here and the American farmers have been buying it to their sorrow. All this amendment does and what it seeks to do is a very important thing, for it gives the farmers the assurance that if baler twine comes into the United States from abroad it will equal the minimum specifications and quality of the American-made baler twine. Is that not highly desirable? Is

that not a great protection to the American farmer who uses the baler twine? One of the things it does it to assure that the twine will do the job. It will avoid the dumping into this country of a lot of material from abroad which can be made from a substitute for the higher quality material which is used by the American manufacturer in producing baler twine sold under the American-made name.

Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that the amendment will be agreed to, for it is a desirable one from the standpoint of the American consumer.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the definition as contained in the gentleman's amendment cover the twine used in the so-called round bale balers?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It will cover anything which qualifies as baler twine, and it will cover the one to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think the gentleman had a limitation as to the number of feet per pound.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. From an industry statement as to what the minimum industrial specifications are, we were assured that this would fit the bill for the American farmer.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Is that minimum or maximum?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. This is the minimum. I have no disposition to conceal anything, of course, but we were told by the industry that this was their minimum specification for the American-made product.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, he would confine the baler twine which could come in duty free to twine not more than 240 feet in length per pound? Is that in the gentleman's amendment? That would be maximum rather than minimum. It could not exceed 240 feet per pound.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It says: 240 feet per pound.

Mr. MILLS. Does the gentleman know how many feet of normally domestic-made baler twine there is to the pound?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. No; I do not. It is approximately 240 feet.

Mr. MILLS. Would there not be a possibility then that the gentleman's amendment might confine the free importation of twine to exactly what we have now, that is, binder twine rather than baler twine?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I was told that these are the minimum specifications for the American industry.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. It may be that 2 or 3 or 5 years from now the specifications would be changed and that American machinery would not use the kind of

twine that the gentleman's amendment provides for.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I suggest that we protect the farmer for these several years and change it thereafter, if necessary. I do not see how we can afford to pass a bill, simply calling it binder twine, and throwing it on the American market. Had it happened in Pennsylvania this year, as far as baler twine is concerned, it would have been gobbled up. The farmers were anxious to get it, even though it was very poor.

Mr. RAYBURN. I know this, it certainly would have been gobbled up in our State, because in my neighborhood 40 hay balers stood idle at one time because they could not get wire or baler twine.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. We should protect the farmers, and if the farmers want baler twine they should get baler twine.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is not seeking to put any limitation on with respect to the binder twine that is to be imported free?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. No.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Now, if we are going to put any limitation on baler twine, it would be fair also to change the law that has existed for 40 years with respect to binder twine.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. May I point this out? There is a definition today as to what binder twine is, and no one can import binder twine, even though it comes in free, and sell as binder twine without meeting that limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That limitation is in the laws today because of court decisions which have laid down a definition of what binder twine is. What I propose to do is avoid the necessity of a lot of court cases until a final conclusion is made defining baler twine, which I think would be this definition.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It seems to me if you are going to put limitations on baler twine imported free of duty you ought to do the same thing on binder twine.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The courts have already done just that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman's definition coincide with the courts' definition?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mine was made applicable to baler twine, which is a heavier twine than is binder twine, which is already defined by the courts.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I submit to the gentleman that we certainly have not had an opportunity to study the specifi-

cations laid down by the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. We had this amendment in our committee, and the amendment was defeated in the committee. We had ample opportunity to study it, and we did study it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. We had no testimony from the farm organizations as to that?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Perhaps not from the farm organizations.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I mean, we did not have any testimony as to the specifications the gentleman lays down, whether they would be suitable for their purposes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is obviously suitable, because it is what they are buying today, made by the American manufacturers.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the four farm organizations are opposed to this amendment, to any amendment proposing a limitation of time, and to the amendment which proposes to put into the law certain definitions as regards oil and other saturants for the purpose of keeping out rodents and vermin. They say they believe that these amendments are designed as an interference with this bill.

Let me say at this time also that I asked who is proposing these amendments, the source of them. It was admitted, and I believe Mr. Roos himself said, that they did emanate from the Cordage Institute. That is just like turning the farmers' sheep over to the wolves to be tended by them tenderly and safely. The farmers do not want this amendment, but the Cordage Institute does. Mr. Roos proposes it. It comes here to you trying to make itself palatable.

You do not need any such thing as a definition of baler twine as to how many feet there should be in order that it might be used in a baler. It might defeat the purpose of the bill if there are changes in baling machines. The same thing is true about the other amendment. You do not have to say that twine has to have so much oil in it, because it has to have a certain amount as a preservative. The farmers will insist on quality and get it. If you complicate the bill too far, the customs people will levy duty in many instances, due to lack of conformance to specifications.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The purpose of this bill is to assist the American farmers in securing the product they need in their business. The farmers of the country and the farm organizations are opposed to this amendment. They are supporting the bill as reported by the committee.

May I point out the further fact that if we here bind this by a certain number of feet to the pound then in the future if some improvement should be brought about in the manufacture of this type of baling twine it would disrupt the whole situation and might well result in the very defeat of the purpose we here are seeking to accomplish.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct. It would make it absolutely impossible for the manufacturer to conform to any change in a baling machine or the specific use for which the farmer wants to use this baler product without subjecting the twine to duty. Let us not be fooled by this. When you start prescribing an exact number of feet to a pound, then you are getting into difficulties which will throw the controversies right into the court, and it will not produce any baler twine for the farmers. That is precisely what the Cordage Institute wants to accomplish by way of getting around the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Is it not true, however, that you do have a definition today of binder twine even though it is not written into the law? You do have a definition, and it is a definition which has caused the trouble which brings us here and requires us to pass a law including baler twine on the free list.

What I wanted to ask the gentleman from Michigan is whether or not at the present time you do not have a definition of binder twine which does set up the number of feet per pound.

Mr. DINGELL. I think so. I think it is a certain number of feet per pound, but the latitude allowed there would not apply to baler twine without complicating things.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What the gentleman from Pennsylvania is doing, it seems to me, is asking for a definition similar to binder twine.

Mr. DINGELL. I will say this to my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, especially because he favors the bill, that if we find within the first year that there has been any difficulty or any complication by reason of the fact that there has not been written into the law, I will vote with the Republicans for at least once to correct it. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring from the acting majority leader, or perhaps from our distinguished Speaker, whom I see sitting with us, how long we are going to run tonight and if this bill is going to go over until tomorrow if it is not finished tonight.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the distinguished minority leader that we had hoped to finish it tonight. Of course, I believe we would not want to run too long tonight, but if it is not finished tonight it will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think we will run until about 5:30 tonight?

Mr. PRIEST. Let us not bind ourselves by any time, but let us say approximately 5:30.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That would be acceptable. We do not have a very full program for tomorrow and there seems to be no reason for us to work overtime when we can finish this bill tomorrow just as well.

Mr. PRIEST. I think we can run along until about that time anyhow hoping in the meantime that we may be able to finish it by that time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of us, and I for one, would like to have a little time to think this thing over. I have become quite confused the way some of the Members from the city have shown concern about the welfare of the farmers. If we could adjourn at 5 o'clock and collect our thoughts, we would be better informed on this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have had an opportunity to look at the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], for whom I have the highest regard, and I have some questions about some of the language in the amendment which he proposes.

If you have the bill before you, you will see that it amends paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1930, by inserting after the words "binding twine" the words, "and twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials."

That language would then be subject to the proviso in paragraph 1622, to which binding twine is also subject.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] proposes a new paragraph, known as paragraph 1622-A, so that if it should be adopted you would have a paragraph 1622 on binding twine and 1622-A on baler twine.

In his amendment the gentleman says that baler twine may not exceed 240 feet per pound; that it shall contain not less than 8 percent of oil by weight, and be mildew proof, and treated to repel insects and rodents.

It is my understanding from talking to people who know more about it than I do that there is no such thing as mildew-proof twine. We have twine in the United States that we sell which has been mildew-proofed. Efforts have been made, so I am informed, to make it mildew proof, as much as it is possible to make it, but neither domestic producers, nor anyone else, actually know any process that will guarantee to keep mildew out of twine if it is held for any length of time.

In my opinion this particular language raises a technicality that might well confuse the situation and lead to all sorts of time-consuming disputes and litigation.

Then I call attention to this situation also: Today baler twine can come in from any source, provided an ad valorem duty of 15 percent is paid.

Whether it is mildew-proof, whether it is treated to repel rodents and insects, or whether it is 240 or 290 feet to the pound, such restrictions by way of specifications may well raise technicalities that will actually defeat the entire purpose which we have in mind in this bill, namely, placing baler twine on the free list, where it was intended to be and I think anyone in reading paragraph 1622 would say that the customs officials erred by not putting it there. The technicalities that have been raised in saying that baler twine is not within the definition of binder twine in paragraph 1622 have appeared to me at once fallacious and illogical. I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is opposed to the legislation, but I would much rather see the bill defeated by the House than to see the House adopt amendments which none of us understand fully and which might actually result in defeating the purpose of the bill.

We do not know what the expression "240 feet per pound" will mean in reference to baler twine. There may be changes in baling machines and the weight might be affected in such a way as to make twine satisfactory for use by them subject to duty. I do not know whether the expression "8 percent of oil by weight" would raise a technicality or not. It certainly would cause complications from a customs point of view. I understand definitely, however, that when you put in the words "mildew proof" they mean that it cannot mildew.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman. I do not know what the words "mildew-proof" mean; I want to know.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. "Mildew-proof," as is customary in much legislation, is a phrase used in the trade; it is the thing that is considered by the courts in that sense; it means just what it says in the sense of a trade practice and policy. There would be no difficulty in interpreting it.

Mr. MILLS. Let me ask the gentleman a question: Does the phrase "mildew-proof" as used in this amendment mean that baler twine would come in without mildew on it? Or that it will not mildew after the farmer gets it? What does it mean? I do not understand.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. If the American farmer saw mildew on it he would not buy it.

Mr. MILLS. That is right, exactly, and for that reason I cannot see why any such amendment is necessary. The

farmer knows his twine. We can leave it up to him.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. If he sees something that has been treated in the way the trade treats it, he has reason to believe that it has been mildew-proofed and he would buy it.

Mr. MILLS. I still do not know what it means.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It means that it has been treated as is customary in the trade, that everything has been done to proof it against mildew.

May I take 1 second more on the other point of the 240 feet per pound?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. If we do not have some limitation there, we will run into the shipping into the country, I fear, of a lot of so-called baler twine which contains a great many more feet to the pound and which will be of less strength and lower quality, and the American farmer will find himself offered a defective and inferior product.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will pardon the interruption, that could have happened all along by the payment of the 15-percent ad valorem duty, but I do not know of any complaint that has been raised by farm organizations or farmers who have been so mistreated by the importers of this twine. If they have not been in the past, I wonder if there is as much possibility as my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], fears of that situation happening in the future if it is on the free list? I am advised that the farm organizations have had a chance to know somewhat of these amendments and they fear them; they feel that the purpose of the legislation may be defeated if the amendments are adopted and that they are not necessary at all. I urge that the amendments be defeated.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems clear that we shall be unable to finish the bill within any reasonable time today. I therefore move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE NEED FOR EAGLE GORGE DAM

(Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter.)

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the House and Senate conferees on the Army civil functions appropriation bill will agree to retain the provision of the Senate bill which provides for the sum of \$50,000 to begin construction of the Eagle Gorge Dam in the State of Washington. This is a flood-control project which is of considerable importance to my congres-

has been canvassed and I am wrong, but I still think that the word "which" is better than the word "who." But if the gentleman wants it that way, then leave it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is a motion to recommit in order?

The SPEAKER. Not on a resolution from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is very evident from what has happened here that this resolution was not given adequate consideration; and if I recall correctly, inasmuch as the Speaker suggested an amendment, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] of the Rules Committee who has charge of the legislation has offered an amendment, it does seem that the resolution should go back to the Rules Committee and there be given a little more thought and consideration and then promptly as perfected brought back and adopted.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LYLE. My thought was that we might pass this resolution as it has been amended and that the gentleman might offer his suggestions to the Committee on Rules so that the entire membership of the committee might consider them. I hesitate to take the responsibility of yielding for amendments to which I have given no thought and to which the Committee on Rules has given no thought. I am not hostile to the idea of the gentleman from Michigan, but I think in the interest of better procedure he might lay his suggestions before the Committee on Rules and let the entire membership of the committee pass on it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean we should adopt the resolution now pending and then go back before the Rules Committee with a perfecting resolution?

Mr. LYLE. I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. To me it would seem that the better procedure would be to let the resolution go back to the Committee on Rules for further consideration and then let them bring it in again at any time. Apparently an overwhelming majority of the membership wants an amendment to the present rule. This amendment which has just been adopted striking the last three lines would make it possible to deprive the minority of representation on any standing committee or subcommittee of such a committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, there are two principal objectives sought

to be attained here. The first is to void the effect of the Supreme Court decision in respect to a quorum and to make it possible for committees to operate when there is not present a majority of the entire membership. The second objective is to try to give some assurances that in these hearings there will be both majority and minority Representatives present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me interrupt right there. By the amendment just adopted, lines 12, 13, and 14 have been stricken.

Mr. HALLECK. Because of the question that I raised, and I think very properly so, the proviso as presently worded might become an effective obstacle, in fact a complete obstacle, to carrying on hearings if the amendment is adopted. However, as the amendment was adopted, then out the window went anything that would undertake to require that both majority and minority Members be present. I am not so sure but what the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan merits consideration. This matter should be further considered by the Rules Committee. We want to correct the situation that has confronted us, but in correcting it we ought to do it in a proper way and in such manner as will accomplish the objectives that I am quite sure we all want to accomplish.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman that under the situation in the House as it now exists, I propose to offer a motion that the resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Rules, hoping that the committee will take prompt action after a little more consideration and after some of us who wish a change have been heard and then report back promptly to the House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan. If the resolution is adopted as it stands now, the minority will have no protection whatsoever. We can have one-man hearings which I do not think is a good thing. There has been handed to me suggested language that would read as follows in lines 12, 13, and 14:

Provided, That any such quorum of less than a majority of its entire membership shall consist of not less than one Member of the majority party and one Member of the minority party.

That would protect the minority, as I see it, and will also be in line with the purposes of the resolution. In other words you have membership of minority and majority.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be re-referred to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 173]

Abbott	Gavin	Morrow
Adair	Gordon	Miller, Calif.
Allen, Calif.	Gore	Morano
Allen, La.	Granahan	Morgan
Anderson, Calif.	Granger	Morrison
Andresen,	Green	Morton
August H.	Gwinn	Moulder
Angell	Hagen	Multer
Barrett	Hall	Murphy
Bates, Ky.	Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.
Bender	Harden	O'Konski
Bentsen	Hardy	Ostertag
Bishop	Hart	Passman
Blackney	Harvey	Patman
Boggs, La.	Havener	Philbin
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Potter
Breen	Hébert	Powell
Brooks	Hedrick	Quinn
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Rabaut
Brownson	Heller	Rains
Buckley	Herlong	Reams
Buffett	Herter	Redden
Burton	Hill	Ribicoff
Busbey	Hillings	Richards
Butler	Hinsaw	Riley
Camp	Hoeven	Rivers
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Carlyle	Holifield	Rooney
Carnahan	Holmes	Roosevelt
Case	Howell	Sadlak
Celler	Hunter	St. George
Chatham	Irving	Scott,
Chudoff	Jackson, Calif.	Hardie
Clevenger	James	Secrest
Colmer	Javits	Shafer
Combs	Johnson	Sheehan
Corbett	Jonas	Shelley
Cotton	Jones,	Sikes
Coudert	Hamilton C.	Sittler
Crawford	Kearns	Smith, Wis.
Crosser	Kee	Stefan
Curtis, Nebr.	Kelly, N. Y.	Stigler
Davis, Ga.	Kennedy	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Tackett
Dawson	Kerr	Talle
Deane	Kersten, Wis.	Taylor
Dempsey	Kilburn	Teague
Denry	Klein	Thornberry
Denton	Lane	Vall
Dollinger	Latham	Vorys
Dolliver	LeCompte	Weichel
Donohue	Lesinski	Werdell
Eaton	Lind	Wharton
Ellsworth	Lucas	Wigglesworth
Elston	McCarthy	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	McCormack	Wilson, Tex.
Fine	McCulloch	Withrow
Fisher	McGrath	Wolcott
Fogarty	McKinnon	Wood, Ga.
Frazier	McMillan	Wood, Idaho
Furcolo	Mack, Ill.	Yates
Gamble	Martin, Iowa	Zablocki
Gary	Meador	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and forty-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FREE IMPORTATION OF BALER TWINE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1005, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: Strike out of H. R. 1005 all matter after the enacting clause, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That after paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended, insert the following new paragraph:

"1622 (a). Baler twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle, or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn or a mixture of any two or more of them, single ply, and measuring not exceeding 240 feet to the pound, containing not less than 8 percent of oil by weight, mildew proofed, treated to repel insects and rodents and chiefly used in an automatic pick-up baler in the baling of hay, straw, and fodder."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, as I announced yesterday, and as seems quite obvious, is to place in the law a definition of just what baler twine is. There is no one in this room who can tell us what it is except by the general practice of going into a store and buying baler twine and getting what the American industry or the present competitive industry sells to us as baler twine. If one goes to buy binder twine which is coming into this country from abroad, he buys a certain quality and a certain weight and strength; but there is no protection for the American purchaser in buying baler twine. So I want to have this law which is to be written today include a definition of just what is baler twine.

The definition I have suggested, which was discussed yesterday, is the one which presently covers the qualities of all the American-made baler twine.

Yesterday the Speaker raised the question that perhaps sometime in the future it might be possible to make baler twine lighter and stronger; and, consequently, that instead of there being 240 feet to the pound representing the high and acceptable quality of baler twine needed, perhaps 250 feet would not be an undue length. Possibly he was right, and later I propose asking unanimous consent to take care of that. But it does seem to me that everyone should want to protect the American farmer who goes out to buy his baler twine, protect him from the danger of being sold a twine which purports to be baler twine but which is not.

Secondly, if we change this law in accordance with the bill as now written anybody can ship into the United States a twine calling it baler twine, which is not baler twine, and which cannot be used as baler twine, but which could be

used as wrapping twine in industry generally to tie packages. That would come in duty free. It is now taxable.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. When the Speaker raised that question yesterday, I want to assure the gentleman, as I saw it and as I understood it, the Speaker opposed any footage specification whether it be 240 or 250 or any other number of feet per pound. I think the Speaker is quite willing to accept the good judgment of the farmers about the kind of baler twine he wants to fit his particular purposes. The farmer has needed no protection by way of specifications up until now on imported baler twine.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is not protected today.

Mr. DINGELL. It is. It is competitive, and that is sufficient protection for it. It has insecticides in it, it has quality.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. If we change the law, there will be no limitation whatever to what one may ship into the country, calling it baler twine. The American farmer can buy or not, as he sees fit. I say there should be written into the law some definition as to what is baler twine so that the American manufacturer and the foreign manufacturer will be in competition.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. My fear is if we begin to specify pounds, feet, and things like that. This twine comes to the customs collector and if it is off a half-inch or one-sixteenth of a pound the customs collector could turn it down. That is exactly what I fear now on the proposition of tying this thing down to feet or pounds or ounces of oil, and so forth. I fear that the gentleman is going to defeat what it seems a majority here wants to do and that is to see that the American farmer will not be left another year like he was this year without a sufficient amount of twine. I have had personal experience with that very matter this year, and hundreds and hundreds of other farmers have had the same experience. I fear if you tie this thing down to feet and pounds, in all probability you might defeat what it appears a majority of the membership of the House wants to do here today.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. At the moment industry in the United States manufacturing baler twine manufactures it out of acceptable quality and it runs approximately 225 feet to the pound. Under the amendment as it stands at the moment, they would be allowed to make a product called baler twine containing 240 feet to the pound which gives a very large latitude over and above the present average of 225.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe there should be some protection for the American purchaser in buying baler twine just as there is today for the farmer buying binder twine which comes in from abroad. That definition has been laid down by the courts. A definition of baler twine will be laid down some day by our courts, but in the meantime I cannot hazard a guess as to what harm will be done to the American farmer through misrepresentation.

With that thought in mind, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the amendment now pending at the desk, to have it read "250 feet" to the pound instead of 240 feet, and to add after the word "rodents" "and to resist mildew," then continue as it is "and chiefly used in an automatic pick-up baler in the baling of hay, straw, fodder" and to add "bedding materials."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the amendment as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: Strike out of H. R. 1005 all matter after the enacting clause, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That after paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended, insert the following new paragraph:

"1622 (a). Baler twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle, or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn or a mixture of any two or more of them, single ply, and measuring not exceeding 250 feet to the pound, containing not less than 8 percent of oil by weight, treated to repel insects and rodents, and to resist mildew, and chiefly used in an automatic pick-up baler in the baling of hay, straw, fodder, and bedding materials for animals."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to ask first whether or not this very amendment did not originate with the Cordage Institute?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I explained yesterday that the amendment as introduced then did originate with industry; whether it came direct from the institute or not, I do not know. I am willing to say it did, because it does exactly what the people who make the product know most about.

Mr. DINGELL. The amendment presently before us is substantially the same as the one introduced yesterday except for the footage, and that amendment originated with the Cordage Institute, and by passing it we will circumvent the purposes of this bill. I stated at the time that this is one bill that the Cordage Institute is not going to amend so far as I am concerned. The gentleman will admit that we passed on these very amendments in committee, and they were voted down.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I suggest that the origin of a quality amendment should not be the determining factor, whether we adopt the proviso or not. After all, it is one of quality.

Mr. DINGELL. It is not a question of quality, I will say to my friend. It is a matter of trying to create embarrassment at the port of entry. Any customs inspector can take a ball of this twine out of any bale and it can run 200 or 250 or any other number of feet to the pound, and if it exceeds the provision or in any way violates it, going beyond the stipulation by inches, he can reject the whole shipment of 10 or 20 carloads, and this would continue to occur and actually discourage the foreign importer from shipping the product into the United States, and that is precisely what the Cordage Institute want to do by circumvention. They know they cannot do it in this House by direct action.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows me well enough to know that I am not trying to do anything that is improper here by suggesting this amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. I am not charging that.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. All right.

Mr. DINGELL. But I am constrained to object. Let us have it out on the bill as introduced. Ten feet will not make any difference whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I realize that the gentleman's amendment is a very wise amendment. It is to protect the farmers against an inferior quality of twine coming into this country.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is the purpose.

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to point out to the gentleman, when he goes to his office, to read the telegram sent by Mr. Hogate. Of course, there is a fine propagandist representing these foreign interests. Whether he sent it or it was sent under his inspiration, I do not know, but it has gone out to the Members that this bill must not be amended. So, of course, you can readily see what is behind this proposal.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes. We are losing sight entirely of the fact that in addition to baling twine much other material used for packaging is involved in this bill. Everything that comes from abroad now, or that can come in the future, which is twine and is used to wrap packages will come in free under this proposal we have here. They call it binder twine.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the distinguished gentleman will agree that there is no provision in law today to protect the American farmer in the purchase of twine manufactured in this country.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The only protection he has is the farmer's own good judgment and sound discretion. The gentleman knows that the American manufacturers have provided that protection through our great American system of competition, the free-enterprise system. They put on their packages, "This is baling twine," and the American farmer knows what it is. He will not know what it is when it is done by a foreign company shipping it into this country, when it may be wrapping twine or anything. They can get around it by paying the duty on the binder twine. Of course, the American farmer is protected today by the American manufacturer. Under this proposal he will have no protection whatever from the inferior-made baling twine coming out of Mexico.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the Federal Trade Commission would be in a position to protect the farmer against the American product but not against the foreign producer?

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. Chairman, those who want this bill passed I should think would want the language different from that stated in the bill. What is this whole bill about? This whole bill is only about four lines long. Let us see what it says. It states that a certain paragraph is amended by inserting after the words "binding twine," a few words, not more than about 15. The present law uses the words "binding twine." The proposed law provides that following that these words shall be inserted, "and twine chiefly used for baling hay." That is fairly definitive but not very much so. "Twine chiefly used for baling hay." One man might want twine of a certain dimension and a certain weight, and someone else might want something else.

Let us take the next words, "baling hay, straw, and other fodder." But what about these words, "bedding materials"? What does that mean? The word "bedding" means a bed. It means a bed upon which people sleep. Ostensibly this meant bedding that the farmer uses, but it does not say so. Why have you who favor this legislation taken off on the fantastic view of somebody who is supposed to be a lobbyist or somebody who is a Detroit farmer? Why do not you farmers get into the law the language that will do the job? This language will not do the job. It does not mean anything. If you are going to pass this bill, I should think you would

want language in it that makes sense, anyhow.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The fact is that the testimony before the committee shows, and it is true today, that the farmers of the country and the farm organizations want the bill just as it was reported by the committee, and they are opposed to this amendment.

Mr. JENKINS. At no time in the discussions of the committee was this language gone into from a technical standpoint. The point is, how are you going to control those who have the responsibility as customs officers and admit goods into this country? What are they going to say about bedding? Someone will say, "I want this kind, I am going to wrap a bed of some kind." It surely does not mean that, but you do not say what it does mean. You are just blindly going to write language in that does not mean anything specific and somebody will have to explain.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. We protect the public in the purchase of other things. For instance, in the case of pottery, the country of origin must be stamped on the pottery, as well as with other goods. But here, when it comes to the farmers, no, we cannot give them any protection, but something has to be done for the benefit of the foreign producers.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] has gone to the trouble of getting the opinion of those who make these products. He did not ask for the opinion of somebody who does not know anything about it. I say to you, that those of you who are interested in this, should see to it that we get an opinion from downtown, from those who import and control the importation of these products.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is well for us to keep in mind that this amendment is sponsored by those who have opposed the legislation in committee, and all the way through, in the interest of the domestic producers of baling twine. Those who have opposed the legislation all the way through against the farmers and the farm organizations now show a great deal of concern for the farmers. You all know that it is the customary rule and tactic of those who oppose legislation, when they find they cannot defeat the legislation on its merits, to try to defeat it by offering crippling amendments, which will make the legislation ineffective and not carry out the purposes for which the legisla-

tion is introduced. How is it that the farm organizations need the guardianship of those who are opposed to this legislation?

As to the farm organizations, it was said just a moment ago that their position is fantastic. This bill is all for agriculture. This bill is of the farmer, by the farmer, for the farmer, and from the farmer and the farm organizations. They sponsored this legislation, and they are standing by it, as it is, without amendments and without modification. They feel that this amendment should not be adopted. I will read a telegram from them, which is dated today, stating their position so that those of you who are going to vote for this amendment may do so with your eyes open to the fact that you are voting against the avowed, expressed will and judgment and desire of the farm organizations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just do not follow your argument.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not expect you to because I suppose you are opposed to the legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what you say. I do not know.

Mr. DOUGHTON. You have not heard my argument yet. How can you tell whether you are going to believe it or not, and are going to be for the legislation until I complete my argument?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Your assumption that those who oppose the legislation are offering these amendments to cripple it does not quite follow. For example, suppose a doctor prescribes that I take so much whisky each day, but I cannot take it without a little water—can I not suggest an amendment to his prescription?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I would want to know who the doctor is and whether he is a quack doctor or a trained physician. That is what I would want to know. Your doctor is a quack doctor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The doctor seems to be in this case some particular lobbyist.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will read this telegram which is directly from the farm organizations:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON:
Our organizations—

You will please note that is in the plural—

continue to oppose any amendment to H. R. 1005, up for further consideration Friday.

What follows refers to the Simpson amendment.

Proposed specifications amendment, falsely labeled as protection against inferior twines, endanger basic objectives of this bill. Experience has shown such specifications for binder twine, on the free list, unnecessary. Any amendments providing temporary suspension of duty would not permanently rectify short supply and high prices which are of primary concern to farmers.

Of course, that is the purpose of it, to destroy, kill, and defeat the basic objectives of the bill. That is what the farm organizations say. That is not what Bob DOUGHTON, chairman of the Committee

on Ways and Means is saying. These farm organizations say that the purpose of this amendment is to defeat the objectives of this bill. Now, that should carry some weight, notwithstanding the suggested guardianship of someone who has been opposing this legislation all the way. This amendment did not originate in the fertile brain of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania at all. It originated in the New York office of Mr. Roos, who appeared before our committee for the Cordage Institute, or someone representing his views. That is where it had its birth. These fears are not entertained by those who are in favor of the legislation. It is those who are opposed to the legislation who entertain these fears and objections. That is where the amendment comes from.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. In a moment I will yield.

This telegram refers to a subsequent amendment which will be offered, and states:

Any amendment providing temporary suspension of duty would not permanently rectify short supply and high prices.

Of course, we all know if a termination date is inserted, making this only temporary legislation, the foreign manufacturers would not change their facilities. They would not increase their productive capacity. They would not encourage their manufacturers to produce. So that is just another amendment intended by those who are opposed to the legislation to defeat the purposes of the legislation. These farm organizations are opposed to both amendments, to the Simpson amendment and to the amendment which would set a termination date on this bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. You say the Simpson amendment originated in the office of the manufacturers in New York?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Or someone with similar interests.

Mr. REED of New York. If it did, I do not know one way or the other. I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] is a friend of the farmers, as the rest of us are. I am just as much of a farmer as you are. I own a farm and I know something about it. I know something about the farm organizations in my district. But I ask you, Where did that telegram originate? It originated with the Canadian lobbyists. That is where it originated, and went out of here just last night.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does my distinguished friend, the distinguished minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, rate the farm organizations as lobbyists? My friend, the prosperity of this country depends in large measure on the prosperity of the farmer.

Mr. REED of New York. I did not charge those organizations with being lobbyists, but you know just as well as I do that this man Hogate, who is getting a thousand dollars a month to put this over for a mill in Ontario, Can-

ada, originated this telegram. You know that. You know he is responsible for that telegram.

Mr. DOUGHTON. How much do you suppose this man Roos, who appeared before our committee against this legislation, is getting? He went so far as to say that binder twine, which is now admitted free, should have an import duty of 25 percent, and that the tariff on baler twine should be not 15 percent, but 25 percent. How much do you suppose he is getting as a lobbyist? If my friend wants to belabor the four great farm organizations of this country, that is for him to decide.

Every national farm organization which studies the problem of the farmer and knows the interest of the farmer and has at heart the welfare of the farmer, every one of them to a man, is opposed to these amendments because they know that they are not intended to help the farmer; these amendments are intended to help the domestic producers of baler twine. The farm organizations know that it is against their interest. That is the reason that, at this late hour, after having read this amendment, and analyzing it, they are so earnestly and so actively opposed to it.

This amendment proposes an entirely different bill, for it strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts an entirely different proposition for an entirely different purpose. I do not accuse my good friend of improper motives; I do not pass upon the conscience or motives of any man, but I do question his judgment on what is in the interest of the American farmer; I do question that. And when he sets himself up as the guardian of the farmer and farm organizations against their will, I think he assumes a great deal of authority.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment should be defeated for the following reasons:

A. The farmer has been able to determine for himself the suitability of binder twine over the years. Except for an outside limitation respecting the number of feet per pound for the free importation of binding twine, there was nothing in the Tariff Act of 1930, the existing law, setting forth elaborate specifications for the protection of the American farmer and he seems to have fared pretty well. I might point out that neither has there been any law passed by Congress which would require domestic manufacturers to furnish the farmer with binding twine of a particular grade. The farmer knows what he needs and if a product is not any good it will not take him long to find it out, and that product will soon vanish from the market.

B. Baler twine has been coming into the United States after payment of the existing tariff of 15 percent and the farmer has needed no elaborate specifications to protect him against inferior quality. A farmer today can buy imported twine by paying the penalty of the 15-percent duty. Nobody protects him now by saying that he must not buy twine that measures a certain footage per pound or that the twine must contain a percentage of oil content or that

it must be indigestible to grasshoppers, rats, and other pests, or that it shall be able to withstand moisture without rotting. Why then, with the removal of the 15-percent penalty, should we impose these limitations upon the farmer? Actually the amendment is an insult to the intelligence of the farmer. It assumes that he cannot judge for himself and cannot rely upon his suppliers to furnish him the proper quality of baler twine that he requires.

C. The best insurance that inferior quality baler twine will not be offered to the American farmer, either by domestic or foreign producers, is to increase the supply so that he does not have to resort to poor quality merchandise.

Both opponents and proponents of this bill seem to concede that repeal of the 15-percent tariff will increase the supply of baler twine available to the American farmer. The proponents of the legislation—the four national farm organizations—testified unequivocally that enactment of the bill would increase the supply of baler twine available in this country.

There would appear to be little reason for the opponents to fear such disastrous consequences as they seem to foresee for domestic manufacturers unless the bill were to result in increased competition from abroad. Now, as I see it, the best way to protect the farmer from being forced to buy low-grade baler twine is to furnish him with an adequate supply of the kind of twine that he needs on the farm and it is not up to the Congress nor anybody else to try to tell him what he needs.

D. The specifications listed in the amendment might be administered in such a way as to exclude baler twine that would be quite satisfactory and necessary for the harvesting of United States crops.

For example, the bill would preclude the entry of baler twine that is not "mildew-proofed." As I understand, there is no such thing as "mildew-proofing." Domestic manufacturers have given the farmer a lot of sales talk about mildew-resistant baler twine but anybody knows that if a bale of hay gets wet enough to rot the baler twine, then the hay itself is going to be just as rotten, if not more so. And the same arguments could be made against the other specifications which it is sought to write into the bill to place into the hands of some customs official to administer.

Mr. Chairman, the four national farm organizations are in favor of this bill without amendment. The friends of the farmer will surely not seek to impose upon him restrictions which he thinks are unnecessary, especially when they are advocated by the opponents of the legislation which the farmer has requested.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, we debated this question about an hour yesterday and have debated it something like half an hour today. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Strike out all matter after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That after paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended, insert the following new paragraph:

"'1622 (a). Baler twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle, or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn or a mixture of any two or more of them, single ply, and measuring not exceeding 250 feet to the pound, containing not less than 8 percent of oil by weight, treated to repel insects and rodents and to resist mildew, and chiefly used in any automatic pick-up baler in the baling of hay, straw, fodder, and bedding materials for animals'."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute for the purpose of giving the gentleman from Pennsylvania an opportunity to perfect the amendment he offered on yesterday. He attempted to make these changes in the amendment by unanimous consent but this was objected to by the gentleman from Michigan. I was rather surprised that he would object to an effort to change the amendment in order to meet the objections of those who are fearful that the amendment might alter the purpose of the bill.

I think some confusion has arisen as a result of the attempt by this amendment to define baler twine. Because the gentleman from Texas expressed some concern over the use of a poundage and length limitation in the definition, I call attention to the fact that in the law today binder twine is defined by weight and length. For the purpose of the RECORD permit me to read section 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1930 which defines binder twine:

All binding twines manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, Manila, istle, or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn or a mixture of any two or more of them, single ply and not exceeding 750 feet to the pound.

That is the law today. That is the definition Congress wrote into the Tariff Act of 1930 to define binder twine.

What are we doing today? We are adding a new class to the group of twines that can be admitted into the country duty-free, twines that are used for the purpose of binding bales. We refer to it as baler twine. Yet the bill proposes no definition or standards for this new twine.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I know the gentleman wants to be entirely fair to the Members of the House. The fact of the matter is that does not apply to binder twine as such.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. You have no definition of baler twine. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. DINGELL. It applies to all binding twine and that footage requirement is all right because it gets down to the point where it controls the business. You do not need that as it applies to baler twine because baler twine will be somewhere around the length of 750 feet.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman can get some time of his own. The reason you are getting into trouble, I am pointing out, is that you are allowing a heavy weight cordage to come in when you allow baler twine to come in and you are going to run into a severe problem of distinguishing between what baler twine is and other cords or cordages of heavy weight. It is for that reason that it is believed by some of us that you will avoid controversy in the courts and before the Customs Bureau if we here write a definition into the law. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with those who say that we who believe there should be some definition are trying to scuttle the bill. Whether this amendment is adopted or not I shall support the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. May I ask the gentleman if, under the present law, there are any specifications saying anything about ratproof, moleproof, foolproof, and gooseproof, and so many ounces of grease to the pound? It would take a chemist at the port of entry to tell whether this met the specifications or not if that were included.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not think so, because the amendment does not call for a strict chemical formula. Binder twine does not require this special treatment. A baler twine, however, requires an entirely different sort of treatment, and this is the general method of preparing and manufacturing baler twine. That is the only reason why it is included in the definition. So far as I am concerned, you could probably leave out some of the requirements contained in this amendment. My only point in introducing the substitute was because of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan objected to the attempt of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to improve his amendment in order to take care of one of the objections raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is a fact that a considerable amount, but not an adequate amount, of baler twine has been admitted under the 15-percent duty, yet there has not been any complaint whatever from the farmers that they were receiving an inferior quality.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not too positive this is going to be of any great importance in assuring quality. I think the farmers are smart enough to protect themselves, if you have a competitive market and a reasonably adequate supply. But if there is a shortage, they will not be able to do so; then they will have an inferior product forced upon them, and they will have to take what they get. I do worry about that.

Under such a situation this amendment would be helpful.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The farmers will soon find that out, and they will not purchase it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I made clear my position that I am not a farmer and that points up, of course, the unfortunate situation that no one else of the friends of the farmer had risen to try and provide an essential for his business; so I, a city-bred chap, had to do it. I think the less said about that by the opposition the better because I have already made that admission yesterday.

I also said in my remarks yesterday that in the Tariff Act of 1930 Congress intended to cover three types of cordage twine.

First. Cordage or rope.

Second. Wrapping and tying twine used for boxes, packages and bundles.

Third. Agricultural binding twine.

Now, what we are concerned with here is binding twine. I do not know what purpose this might serve by striking out everything after the enacting clause, but I again caution the friends of the farmers that you are striking out a farmers' bill and not mine. I told you yesterday, do not vote for this bill because Mrs. Dingell's boy, Johnny, introduced it. Vote for it because the farmers want you to vote for it. Forget about the part I played in its introduction.

Incidentally, I might say that when you talk about Mr. Hogate and Mr. Roos and as to their rate of compensation, I think you can safely say that Mr. Roos has by far the greatest stake in this and he has done so well in protecting the selfish interests of the Cordage Institute against all attempts to rectify the inequity which the farmer has suffered over the years.

I am naturally opposed to this substitute because I am not convinced what it is going to do, but I am pretty certain that substitution will not do the bill any good; that its result will be to circumvent the intent and purposes of the bill. Of course, I will take no chance on that, so the question is now as to whether you will take the bill as is, as the farmers want it, or not. Take it or leave it so far as I am concerned, it will make no difference with me. My window-box farmers will not take it out on me, but I want to warn you to harken back to a previous action taken in this House on grain storage, that the farmer, in the final analysis, did breathe down the necks of those who threw him down, and he will do it again about this baler twine, and do not make any mistake about that. The farmer wants this; the farmer needs it; the farmer's good judgment will protect him as to quality. You do not have to tell him how much oil there is to be in it; you do not have to tell him how thick it has to be. What do we care whether the farmer wants a heavier or lighter baler twine? After

all, the farmer is going to try to get a baler twine that is only as thick and as strong as possible so that he can get the greatest number of bales per ball of twine used, and that is all they are all striving for, and always have. Incidentally, when they do strive for that, that is where competition comes in, but it does not come in under our present system. Remember when I spoke of monopoly? I want to call this to your attention, that out of the five or six or eight concerns who manufacture baler twine, 80 percent of the manufacture is in the hands of two producers. If that is not monopoly, there just is not any monopoly anywhere in the world.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman said that the farmer is able to protect himself very well.

Mr. DINGELL. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. He certainly knows whether he is getting quality or not. But, does not the gentleman believe that when you have a very tight supply, as you had this year, that the farmer is up against it to protect himself against inferior products, because he has to take what he can get?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; but he would be protected if you eliminate this handicap now. The shortage will not be as keen as it is and the farmer will have a chance at selection and choice, and when he knows that a certain twine that he bought last year is inferior, whether it is domestic or imported, he will not get burned on it twice, I will assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened through the whole debate and I believe that I have now made up my mind as to what I want to do in regard to the pending bill.

I was raised by two Democrat parents. I registered in the opposition party because I disagreed with the majority party's socialistic philosophies and deception.

The Republican Party has long been known as the friend of the farmer. That reputation preceded the enactment of income taxes with its capital gains features. It is because I want to aid the farmer and because I know the Republican Party is the only possible organized political friend of the farmer that I have had difficulty following some arguments that have been presented.

The debate establishes certain facts that all of us must agree upon: First, that when there was a shortage of the cordage in question, our farmers did receive all of the available supply from foreign countries. It can be argued that

it was high-priced because of the tariff that now exists. However, it is a fact that it sold at no higher price than domestic cordage. Second, that whatever action we take today will not result in any larger supply of cordage unless more is produced at home or abroad.

It is a fact that there is no duty on the raw materials from which baler twine is made. It is a fact that our domestic producers could easily supply the domestic demand if they had the raw materials. The hearings demonstrate that domestic manufacturers could produce a surplus of the cordage if they brought more of the raw materials from foreign countries. It is a fact that most of the required raw materials that are needed are raised in Mexico. It is a fact that the foreign business concern that is trying to obtain the American market is a Canadian corporation. It is a fact that there are no capital-gains taxes in Canada, if American money wants to go there, buy stock in those corporations, and leave their capital gains in Canadian corporations. It is a fact that the cordage made available to the farmers of this country is sold through certain agencies and if those agencies get an additional supply, either from foreign fields or at home, it will go through those same agencies. It is a fact that under such circumstances, there will not be a cheaper price to the farmer. It is a fact that the administration seeking to aid the Canadian corporation does not seek a price ceiling under existing law on baler twine. It is a fact that if American money controlling American markets and sales agencies produce baler twine in Canada, they will have to go to the White House to get an import license. It is a fact that unless the pending amendment is adopted, new and additional powers will be placed on the steps of the White House.

Let us look at this subject realistically. After all, if we are going to tell American money to get out of the United States, use cheap labor and bring their products back to the American market, tax free, and thereby throw American workingmen out of work, let us be bold about it. I cannot help but feel that this administration has traveled about as far as it can travel under the demagogic guise of being a friend of the farmer or any other hard-working American.

I say to you gentlemen on my right that your chickens are coming home to roost. The day is not far off when every workingman in America will condemn every recent act you have done to disable American industry. You should be condemned for what you have done to put wage differentials of several hundred dollars on a workingman's automobile, children's shoes, ice boxes, refrigerators, clothing, yes, and milk, to be paid for by the other consumers of the country, 90 percent of whom are other workingmen and farmers. I say you should be condemned because this price is too high for votes.

The way the pending bill has been handled by the administration, including the use of language yapping about Republicans representing vested interests, considered with the facts I have

mentioned, should convince any American that those in any political party who support this administration's political bribery programs have been in office too long.

It is interesting to see how much vigor is shown in baler twine requiring a White House import license.

Opposition to this bill means support for America and its institutions. A vote for this bill is a vote for special interests.

Assume, if you will, that you are the domestic producer of baler twine. You know that the market can be supplied by the mere acquisition of raw materials available from foreign countries, tax-free. You can supply the demand by running existing machines a few hours. Certainly you would make no large capital investments to supply a temporary demand if all tariff protection were removed. If it is true that American corporations operate by a balance sheet nervous system, then it is also true that they will operate under the guise of foreign corporations. They will desire to create assets in foreign countries my manufacturing goods for our American markets and keep those assets free of any threat of taxation by the political demagogues of this country. A balance-sheet nervous system will not hesitate to buy fur coats and pay hotel bills if it gets something in return.

There is no doubt in my mind but what the farmers of this country and their organizations have again been deceived. The leaders of farm organizations have been induced to wire Representatives from agricultural districts that they should support special interests.

I am once again happy to be registered in the opposition party because I know who actually does support special interests against the interests of the American farmer and the American workingman.

If we look at this subject reasonably, we will support the pending amendment or oppose the bill. The final passage of this bill will provide no additional baler twine. It will not reduce the price to the farmer. It will permit American money and companies to operate in foreign countries with cheap foreign labor, put our workingmen out of work, and give them the American market already organized for sales purposes by the same American companies.

What the price will be on the balance sheet will probably never be known, but the value received by such companies will be the sale of the same or inferior commodities at the same price, at lower labor costs, and the avoidance of the income-tax laws of the United States and the accumulation of capital gains in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I represent many farmers. I know that the farmer in this country is for our industry and for the continued purchasing power of the American consumer, 90 percent of whom are workingmen. He is for all of this because he realizes it benefits himself and his family.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in the remarks of the gen-

tleman from California who has just addressed the Committee. There is a great deal more to this proposition than baler twine, binder twine, or any other kind of twine. It is a question of whether or not the man who works for a living in this country is going to be taken care of by the Congress of the United States, or if the Congress is going to take care of some foreigner. I do not object to the gentleman from Michigan saying something about the man who lives in my own district because he has a right to be vice president of the Plymouth Cordage Co., and he has the right to tell me why we ought not to pass this bill—and he is so right about it. History has proven that you have to protect American industry and American labor whether he is a farmer, a bricklayer, or a worker in a steel mill or in any other employment; you have to look out for him and not try to look out for somebody who lives in a foreign country which exists on starvation wages.

When this bill came up, I thought it was a proposition having to do with raising money, and getting more money for the country, which is something that the Committee on Ways and Means is supposed to do. However, it has turned into an agricultural bill. You are asking us to vote for this bill because it is supposed to help the poor farmer. Well, I have many farmers in my district. We raise more cranberries in the district I represent, and in the town I live in, than the rest of the world. We raise strawberries and potatoes and everything else.

The farm population in my State is way ahead of the industrial population of the State. I understood there was a shortage of twine this year. Yet statistics show that they produced 17,000,000 more pounds of twine than the Department of Agriculture estimated they would on the basis of their production the year before. Where did the shortage come from? It came from the farm groups that said "Get in and buy your twine this year because there is going to be a shortage." As a result they bought too much of it, and they are going to have it next year because they are well able to pay for it. I was not born yesterday, and I may not be as old as some of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, but I have read American history, and when they talk about this twine going off the duty list in 1894, I want to point out to you that we have 60 percent less people working in the twine business than we had then. The reason for that is they cannot stand the competition of slave labor from other countries. One company after another within a few miles of my house have gone out of business because they could not compete with Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and all these other places that we are paying to support.

Now you come here and say you are going to help the farmer by stopping some business that has been going on here for over 130 years, and which has earned the respect of everybody that they do business with. You say it is going to help them. Can you help the

farmers by hurting somebody else? If you can, then you ought to vote for this bill. But if you believe in America—and I know we all do—and if you feel the way I do about it, you will vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, as has been repeatedly pointed out in the consideration of this bill, the bill (H. R. 1005) is intended to assist the American farmer in securing a product which he needs in the operation of his business. The amendment now proposed and under consideration is offered by one of the strongest opponents of the pending legislation. Certainly, it cannot be offered for the purpose of improving the bill, or for the purpose of assisting the farmer. All of these restrictions which are sought to be imposed by the pending amendment can only result in defeating the purposes sought to be accomplished by this bill.

Many Members have expressed themselves as being interested in the welfare of the farmers. The farmers themselves and the farm organizations are the ones who are sponsoring the pending bill and are opposing the amendment that is now under consideration.

It should be borne in mind that all this bill seeks to do is to remove the present import duty of 15 percent ad valorem from baler twine. That is the only purpose sought to be accomplished, and there is no necessity for complicating the question by adopting any such amendment as is now presented.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman please tell the committee just what baler twine is?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because every farmer in the country knows what baler twine is.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know what baler twine is?

Mr. COOPER. I certainly do. The farmer is the man who buys it and he is the man who uses it. If the customs authorities now know what baler twine is to the extent they can collect 15-percent tariff duty on it, they will know what it is when that tariff is removed. This is the same product that is now under a tariff duty of 15 percent. All the pending bill does is to remove that 15-percent duty.

That is the position that is urged by all the farm organizations here today. I respectfully urge that the pending amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NICHOLSON), there were—ayes 57, noes 88.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 8, insert:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER to the committee amendment: Strike out the period after the word "act" in line 11, and add the following: "and prior to March 1, 1953, but shall not apply to any article entered or withdrawn from the warehouse for consumption on or after such date."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield before he begins his discussion?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COX. I have asked the gentleman to yield that I might call the attention of the House to the fact that at the moment we have a very great American, the Governor of New York, Mr. Dewey, a guest of the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of limiting the operations of this bill to a year and 6 months. I have done this because I believe we would have a better judgment on what we ought to do after the lapse of that much time. Your farmers and your industry are going to be in a very precarious condition in the next year. According to some stories there has been hoarding of baler twine to the tune of as high as 30,000,000 pounds. The Department of Agriculture estimate of use for this current calendar year was 94,000,000 pounds. The actual sales have been 125,500,000 pounds. If there are 30,000,000 pounds hoarded, the manufacturers and the farmers are going to be in a precarious condition as a result of that picture because that 30,000,000 pounds will be a menace to the market next year.

It would seem to me that when we have had a situation where the sales have doubled in 1 year, as a result of that and along with that there has been a shortage in the material that might be available, that it is time for us to think about the situation. We can go ahead with such things as this and we can create situations where American industry can be put out of business. That is not going to help the American farmer; it is not going to help him, because when he gets all through and is dependent upon a foreign source he is going to have the same thing happen to him that happened in the case of burlap bags where the Indian Government put on an export duty of 14 cents a pound; and we are going to see the farmer made

a football by the foreign manufacturers and importers.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and that if the bill is to take effect it will be limited to a year and a half.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 10 minutes, the time to be divided between the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

My rest was disturbed last night after the debate of yesterday, when the trend of thought seemed to be running in the House during the debate on this pending bill to the theory that it did not make any difference if 100 workers here and a thousand workers there might be thrown out of jobs in American industry. I cannot reconcile myself to an attitude of that kind because to my way of thinking no legislation on this floor is justified if it threatens the welfare of one single American worker.

In my district there are about 20,000 Endicott Johnson shoe workers. I wonder if in knocking down the tariff today, a precedent will be created so that next week the Ways and Means Committee will come in here with a bill which will further scare every man and woman in my district who are Endicott Johnson workers. Will it mean that their jobs may be taken away from them because perchance we will import Japanese rubber-soled shoes which will go into direct competition with Endicott Johnson workers? So I am just as much concerned as the 20,000 workers in my district are concerned who sent me penny post cards last year deploring such a possibility. Of course they are not going to be able to send penny post cards much longer because you plan to double the postage rates before long so they will not be able to send penny post cards.

At any rate, I am concerned very much about the whole situation. I conferred with Dean Acheson on this subject of flooding the country with Japanese shoes having rubber soles, and in answer to my question as to what is going to happen to the shoe workers in the rubber and footwear industry, and what they were going to do after having spent a lifetime in this honorable career of shoemaking, he said:

Our program is clear-cut. It does not make any difference if 100 workers here and a thousand workers there or 20,000 workers are thrown out of a job, our program is clear-cut.

I submit that such a position is disastrous to the welfare of American industry. I have gone right down the line with most programs of reciprocity be-

cause I believe that good trade relations between America and the other nations of the world are absolutely necessary. However, I cannot see any justification in deliberately charting a course which will throw American workers out of their jobs.

I want to pose a question today. I am not differing with my good friends on the Ways and Means Committee because they have done a sincere job. But I do want to ask: Is it right to suggest that a thousand workers or many hundreds of workers be thrown out of jobs in order to satisfy, as the gentleman from New York stated, these lobbyists who are running this show and who are pulling the wires?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is this not just the beginning of the end as it was just before World War II when the Japanese were flooding our country with textiles from Japan?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is correct. Before the Japanese flood our country with rubber-soled shoes to drive the workers I represent out of business, I expect to do everything in my power to fight the bills that they bring up here which go in that direction. I cannot be reconciled to any such theory, and I cannot go along with them any more than I would to have shoes from behind the iron curtain come in here in direct competition with the products that the shoe workers in my district or any other district in America are producing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this precedent is not going to be set, and I hope that the House will be able to decide definitely on a course of action which will protect American industry and which will give our workers the opportunity to continue their livelihood.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, one reason this bill is before the Committee at this time is the fact that the farmers of this country, in harvesting one of their major crops, are short of a supply of baler twine necessary in that harvesting. Consequently, much of their hay crops are spoiled or rotting in the field. The other reason is that what supply they have been able to obtain was available only at an exorbitant price. The price has advanced since the opening of the hay season this year from \$11 for a 40-pound bale to about \$18 to \$25 for what they can get.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the distinguished chairman will remember that in the hearing on the pending bill, appears on page 115, a telegram received from the four great national farm organizations of the country, which reads in part as follows with respect to the pending amendment:

A temporary suspension of the duty on baler twine would merely serve to perpetu-

ate the present undesirable situation. It is our belief that no action by the committee would be preferable to creating the temporary illusion that the farmers' needs were being met. We hope this telegram will be made part of the official record of the hearing.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER
COOPERATIVES.
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION.
NATIONAL GRANGE.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution. In that connection it will be remembered that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the author of this amendment, appeared before our committee in opposition to the bill. He did not suggest any amendment at all; he was in opposition to any legislation of this kind. Three witnesses appeared in opposition to the bill and the distinguished gentleman was one of them.

In addition to the statement just read by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] which is a part of the RECORD, a telegram received this morning reiterates the same position. Here is what it says about this amendment:

Any amendment providing temporary suspension of the duty cannot permanently rectify short supply and high prices which are of primary concern to the farmers.

We all know, my friends, if this is only temporary legislation, that the foreign manufacturers who produce this commodity would not expand their facilities and enlarge and increase their factories to provide for a market that they knew would soon be shut off. It is perfectly absurd to think they would expand under such a limitation. The farmers are against this amendment, and as the gentleman from Tennessee said, they would rather have no legislation at all than only a temporary suspension of the duty.

My friends, the issue is before you fair and square: Are you for the interest of the farmer? If so, you will vote for this bill and against the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 47, noes 89.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, all of this discussion pertaining to H. R. 1005 has been very interesting to me. From the facts, there has been so much politics played by Members of the Congress and from both sides of the aisle.

There are some here who inferred that some foreign groups and lobbyists have

influenced those who are for the bill. I resent that inference very much, because I am certain I have not been approached by anyone except farmers in my district of West Virginia, who have asked me to see that something be done to protect their interests. That fact—and only that—is the reason I am in favor of this legislation.

I resent, too, the fact that inference has been made that our four great farmers' organizations have been misled and influenced by lobbyists and foreign interests to the point that they do not represent the wishes of the American farmer and the true interests of the Nation. I feel if we cannot look to these organizations who are interested solely in the farmer and his welfare, our situation in the country is almost hopeless.

I know personally a representative of one of these great farmers' organization. He is John Lynn, of the American Farm Bureau—a young man who fought for his country during the last war, and whose integrity and patriotism will equal any Member of this House. Also, I am sure his knowledge and experience of farm problems and farm legislation is on a par with that of any man who has spoken for or against the bill.

I believe that we, as Members of the House, should be more careful in our remarks in implying that men who do not agree with us are motivated by unpatriotic or unselfish views. As for myself, I am willing to take the advice of these experts who have testified before the committee, and vote in accordance for the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material, pursuant to House Resolution 366, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and

Means with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out the period after the word "act" in line 11, and add the following: "and prior to March 1, 1953, but shall not apply to any articles entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such date."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the alleged purpose of H. R. 1005 is to cure an emergency shortage of baler twine used by our farmers. The present shortage, like other shortages, has arisen as the result of excessive buying. But instead of meeting this emergency problem through emergency legislation, H. R. 1005 is permanent legislation involving in long-range effect our national security, the welfare of our domestic cordage industry, and the American farmer. In my opinion the result of enactment of H. R. 1005 in its present form will be injurious to all three.

The inevitable result of permanently transferring baler twine to the free list will be to destroy domestic production of baler twine and thus put the American farmer at the mercy of foreign producers and foreign imports. There will be little, if any, financial saving to our farmers in the cost of baler twine and once the American industry has been destroyed, the price of the imported baler twine will go up rapidly.

The baler-twine industry, although relatively small in size, ranks among the foremost strategic industries necessary for the prosecution of war, and enactment of H. R. 1005 will have effects which might seriously interfere with the Government's stockpiling program. Manila and sisal fibers have been designated by the Munitions Board among group A stockpiling materials. Fibers in the stockpile cannot be kept permanently, but must be rotated—that is, new fibers added and older fibers sold to our manufacturers.

With the loss of our markets to foreign producers, productive facilities in this country will dry up and, consequently, will not be available to rotate the stockpiled fiber in peacetime nor to convert it into finished products during war. A stockpile of fibers would be meaningless under these circumstances.

I cannot believe that the proponents of this legislation desire that the American cordage industry, manufacturers and employees, be destroyed; that our farmers be placed at the mercy of foreign imports; and that an important part of our future security program be seriously disturbed. These are considerations of much more moment than such temporary advantage, if any, as might result from enactment of H. R. 1005. At least equal temporary benefits without these grave long-range consequences could be obtained by appropriate emergency legislation as contained in the motion to recommit which provides for the free importation of baler twine until March of 1953.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 210, nays 41, answered "present" 1, not voting 177, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

YEAS—210

Aandahi	Eberharter	Murdock
Abernethy	Elliott	Murray, Tenn.
Adair	Engle	Norblad
Addonizio	Feighan	Norrell
Albert	Fenton	O'Brien, Ill.
Andersen,	Fernandez	O'Brien, Mich.
H. Carl	Flood	O'Hara
Andrews	Forand	O'Neill
Arends	Ford	Passman
Armstrong	Forrester	Patterson
Aspinall	Fugate	Perkins
Auchincloss	Fulton	Pickett
Ayres	Garmatz	Poage
Bailey	Gathings	Polk
Baker	George	Preston
Barden	Golden	Price
Battle	Graham	Priest
Beall	Grant	Prouty
Beamer	Greenwood	Ramsay
Beckworth	Gregory	Rankin
Belcher	Gross	Reece, Tenn.
Bennett, Fla.	Hale	Reed, Ill.
Berry	Hall	Rees, Kans.
Betts	Edwin Arthur	Riehlman
Blatna,	Harris	Roberts
Boggs, Del.	Harrison, Va.	Robeson
Bolling	Harrison, Wyo.	Rodino
Boiton	Hays, Ark.	Rogers, Colo.
Bonner	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Bosone	Heslton	Sabath
Bramblett	Hoffman, Mich.	Sasscer
Bray	Hope	Scrivner
Brown, Ga.	Horan	Seely-Brown
Bryson	Hull	Sheppard
Buchanan	Jackson, Wash.	Sieminski
Budge	Jarman	Simpson, Ill.
Buffett	Jenison	Smith, Kans.
Burdick	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Miss.
Burleson	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Burnside	Jones,	Spence
Bush	Woodrow W.	Springer
Byrne, N. Y.	Judd	Staggers
Byrnes, Wis.	Karsten, Mo.	Stanley
Cannon	Kelley, Pa.	Steed
Celler	Keogh	Stigler
Chelf	Kilday	Sutton
Chenoweth	King	Thomas
Chiperfield	Kirwan	Thompson,
Church	Kluczynski	Mich.
Clemente	Lanham	Thompson, Tex.
Cole, Kans.	Lantaff	Tollefson
Cole, N. Y.	Larcade	Trimble
Cooley	Lovre	Van Pelt
Cooper	Lyle	Van Zandt
Cox	McConnell	Vinson
Crosser	McGregor	Vursell
Crumpacker	McGuire	Watts
Cunningham	McMillan	Welch
Curtis, Mo.	McMullen	Wharton
Curtis, Nebr.	Machrowicz	Wheeler
Dague	Madden	Whitaker
Davis, Wis.	Magee	Whitten
DeGraffenried	Mahon	Wickersham
Delaney	Mansfield	Wier
Devereux	Marshall	Williams, Miss.
D'Ewart	Miller, Md.	Williams, N. Y.
Dingell	Miller, Nebr.	Willis
Dondero	Miller, N. Y.	Winstead
Dorn	Mills	Wolverton
Doughton	Mitchell	Yorty
Doyle	Morris	
Durham	Mumma	

NAYS—41

Allen, Ill.	Kean	Rhodes
Bakewell	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Baring	Keating	Rooney
Bates, Mass.	McDonough	Saylor
Bennett, Mich.	McVey	Schwabe
Brehm	Mack, Wash.	Scott,
Brown, Ohio	Martin, Mass.	Hugh D., Jr.
Fallon	Nelson	Scudder
Goodwin	Nicholson	Simpson, Pa.
Halleck	Phillips	Taber
Hand	Poulson	Velde
Hess	Radwan	Walter
Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.	Werdel
Jensen	Regan	Woodruff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mason

NOT VOTING—177

Abbott	Gavin	Morrow
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	Miller, Calif.
Allen, La.	Gore	Morano
Anderson, Calif.	Granahan	Morgan
Andresen,	Granger	Morrison
August H.	Green	Morton
Anfuso	Gwinn	Moulder
Angel	Hagen	Multer
Barrett	Hall	Murphy
Bates, Ky.	Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.
Bender	Harden	O'Konski
Bentsen	Hardy	Ostertag
Bishop	Hart	O'Toole
Blackney	Harvey	Patman
Boggs, La.	Havener	Patten
Bow	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Boydin	Hébert	Potter
Breen	Hedrick	Powell
Brooks	Heffernan	Quinn
Brownson	Heller	Rabaut
Buckley	Herter	Rains
Burton	Hill	Reams
Busbey	Hillings	Redden
Butler	Hinshaw	Ribicoff
Camp	Hoeven	Richards
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Riley
Carlyle	Holifield	Rivers
Carnahan	Holmes	Rogers, Fla.
Case	Howell	Roosevelt
Chatham	Hunter	Sadlak
Chudoff	Irving	St. George
Clevenger	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Colmer	James	Secrest
Combs	Javits	Shafer
Corbett	Johnson	Sheehan
Cotton	Jonas	Shelley
Coudert	Jones,	Short
Crawford	Hamilton C.	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Kearns	Sittler
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Smith, Wis.
Dawson	Kelly, N. Y.	Stefan
Deane	Kennedy	Stockman
Dempsey	Kerr	Tackett
Denny	Kersten, Wis.	Talle
Denton	Kilburn	Taylor
Dollinger	Klein	Teague
Dolliver	Lane	Thornberry
Donohue	Latham	Vail
Donovan	LeCompte	Vorys
Eaton	Lesinski	Weichel
Ellsworth	Lind	Widnall
Elston	Lucas	Wigglesworth
Evins	McCarthy	Wilson, Ind.
Fine	McCormack	Wilson, Tex.
Fisher	McCulloch	Withrow
Fogarty	McGrath	Wolcott
Frazier	McKinnon	Wood, Ga.
Furcolo	Mack, Ill.	Wood, Idaho
Gamble	Martin, Iowa	Yates
Gary	Meador	Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Martin of Iowa for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Harvey for, with Mr. Sheehan against.
Mr. Holmes for, with Mr. Busbey against.
Mr. Stefan for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Angeil for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.
Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Bow against.
Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Latham against.
Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. James against.
Mr. Bishop for, with Mr. Bender against.
Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Gavin against.
Mr. Abbott for, with Mr. Murphy against.
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.
Mr. Donovan for, with Mr. Hinshaw against.
Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.
Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Tackett with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Miller of California with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Shelley with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Elsworth.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Ostertag.
Mr. Havenner with Mr. Sadiak.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Talie.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Case.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Green with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Wolcott.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Wood of Idaho.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Cotton.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Morrow.
Mr. Redden with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Denny.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Allen of California.

Mr. Lind with Mr. Vail.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Hunter.
Mr. Howell with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Burton with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CAMP. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority whip if he can give us the program for next week?

Mr. PRIEST. On Monday we will take up the Consent Calendar and one suspension. That suspension is S. 1864 from Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Also I am informed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that he hopes to call up on Monday the conference report on H. R. 1726 pertaining to the organization of the Air Force.

On Tuesday we will take up the Private Calendar. Following that we will take up House Resolution 390. That is the resolution providing for the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, originally scheduled for this week. Also on Tuesday we will start consideration of the bill H. R. 2982, readjustment of postal rates. The gentleman from

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1005

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 17 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance

AN ACT

To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff
4 Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after
5 the words "binding twine" a comma and the words "and
6 twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder
7 and bedding materials,".

8 SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effec-
9 tive with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from ware-
10 house, for consumption after the date of the enactment of
11 this Act.

Passed the House of Representatives September 14,
1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

82^d CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 1005

AN ACT

To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

SEPTEMBER 17 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance

them, jointly, to Senate bill 436, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. AIKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 436, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. LEHMAN) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 436, supra, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorial, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WATKINS:

Statement prepared by him with reference to Constitution Day, September 17, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "The Gap Between Congress and Main Street," written by Senator DOUGLAS and published in the New York Times magazine section of September 16, 1951.

By Mr. HILL:

Editorial entitled "Behold Acheson's Vindication," published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of September 14, 1951, and written by the editor, Capt. Grover C. Hall, Jr.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Editorial entitled "Needed: Some Devil's Advocates," published in the Washington Evening Star of September 17, 1951, referring to an appropriation for additional employees for the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Article entitled "Mindful of Our Own Frailties," by Thomas L. Stokes, published in the Washington Star, with reference to the burial in Arlington Cemetery of Sgt. John R. Rice, Winnebago Indian, killed in Korea.

By Mr. TAFT:

Editorial entitled "A Friend in Need," relating to the Taft-Hartley Act and the copper strike, published in the American Metal Market for September 8, 1951.

By Mr. SCHOEPPPEL:

Article entitled "How the Government Succeeded in Reducing Beef Supplies in the Face of a Record Cattle Population," published in Economic Trend Line Studies, of August 20, 1951, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Letter from Tom. F. W. Barth, professor of mineralogy, University of Oslo, regarding the exchange-of-students program.

Letter from George Vogel regarding visit of two Lafayette College freshmen to the Strike It Rich program indicating their interest in the exchange-of-students program.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. MUNDT):

Press statement released by Senator MUNDT on September 17, 1951, entitled "Announcement of Formation of Bipartisan Committee To Explore Political Realignment."

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorials from the Baltimore Sun of September 16, 1951, and the Washington Post of September 11, 1951, dealing with air mail and subsidies.

ARTICLES RELATING TO HEARINGS BY INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer for printing in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch which refers to a debate on the floor of the Senate on Friday. The dispatch obviously relates to an attempt to discredit the work of a subcommittee of this body. I think the kindest thing which can be said about the columnist writing the dispatch is that he is proadministration; and the least that can be said about the nature of the article is that it is unprecedented. I now offer it, to be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. MALONE. And I desire to go on record as joining the Senators who have indicated a desire to see that the work of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is completed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Nevada will have to be dealt with according to the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing. If the Senator's request is not in violation of the rule or the resolution adopted by the Joint Committee on Printing, the article to which the Senator has referred may be printed as a part of the Senator's remarks. If that would be in violation of the rule or resolution, the Chair does not feel that he can entertain a request to violate the resolution adopted under the statutes creating the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this is the first time that I have ever heard the distinguished President of this body define the rule. I requested the inclusion of the dispatch in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, if that is acceptable; and, if not, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is not a violation of the rule and resolution of the joint committee, the article will be placed in the body of the RECORD; otherwise it will go into the Appendix of the RECORD. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, may we have a definition of the rule? It is not my desire to violate any rule of the Senate, but I do wish to have the dispatch printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to obtain a copy of the rule; he does not have it at his hand at this moment, and will let the matter be disposed of according to the rule. If the rule prohibits such printing, the article will go into the Appendix of the RECORD. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. MALONE. Then I hope it will be a general rule, not applicable only to this dispatch.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, of course, it is a general rule; but, like many other rules, it has been violated a great deal.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to read an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the September 15 issue of the Washington Evening Star. It is

headed "LEHMAN Is Undecided on Pressing Writer's Charges of Perjury." I read: LEHMAN IS UNDECIDED ON PRESSING WRITER'S CHARGES OF PERJURY

Senator LEHMAN, Democrat-Liberal, of New York, left hanging today the question of whether he would take further steps to get an investigation of charges involving testimony given to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

His demand for such an investigation yesterday brought a heated retort from Senator McCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, that Senator LEHMAN had accused him of encouraging a witness to commit perjury. The New Yorker denied he had made any such charge.

Senator McCARRAN is chairman of the subcommittee, which is investigating any subversive influences on United States policies in the Far East. A prolonged series of hearings now is underway.

Senator LEHMAN asked for a full investigation of what he called grave charges published by Columnist Joseph Alsop that demonstrably false testimony had been taken by the McCARRAN subcommittee.

In recently published articles Mr. Alsop charged that testimony by ex-Communist Louis Budenz relating to John Carter Vincent and John S. Service, State Department officials, was in contradiction of his own previous testimony.

CHARGE CALLED TRAVESTY

Senator McCARRAN, not present when Senator LEHMAN first voiced his demand, later shouted to the Senate that the New Yorker wants to sponsor a columnist's charges that a committee of the Senate is guilty of subornation of perjury—that is, getting another person to commit perjury.

Angrily, Senator McCARRAN denounced this as a travesty which he said amounted to "accusing me of subornation of perjury."

Senator LEHMAN shot back that Senator McCARRAN "puts words in my mouth which I never uttered and which I never thought. I have not accused him of subornation of perjury."

He emphasized that he did not know whether Mr. Alsop's charges were true or false, but he said he regarded the charges as grave and felt they should be investigated.

Later a reporter asked Senator LEHMAN if he intended to introduce a resolution calling for an investigation. He replied that he already had brought the matter to the attention of the Senate and couldn't tell yet what further action he might take.

WELKER BLOCKS LEHMAN MOVE

Senator McCARRAN told a reporter that when the subcommittee's hearings were all over, the people could see for themselves who was right. In the Senate he had said that "all the Alsops from here to perdition can't stop this committee from going forward."

Senator LEHMAN tried to place the Alsop articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senator WELKER, Republican, of Idaho, blocked this in a parliamentary situation that enabled any one Senator to do so.

Senator BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine, suggested that Senator LEHMAN's demand for a Senate investigation of one of its own committees was without precedent.

Senator LEHMAN said he lacked sufficient information to form a judgment about the charges but insisted they should be investigated "to remove the stain upon the Senate, as I hope, or if the facts prove to be as printed, to form the basis for corrective action."

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada is doing a good job, and he should be permitted to continue, and should encounter a minimum of resistance from this august body which created the committee in the first instance.

Mr. MALONE subsequently said: Mr. President, continuing my remarks, I wish to refer to the testimony of Mr. Eugene Dooman on September 14 before the Judiciary Committee's subcommittee investigating the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security matters. As far back as the late thirties there were indirect attacks on any organization or the presentation of any ideas which might retard the State Department's plan to turn over China and Asia to Communist Russia.

Mr. President, if these indirect attacks were isolated, and did not form a pattern, they would not be so dangerous. However, they were not isolated and they did form a pattern.

More than a year ago I said on the floor of the Senate that there were two men whose services the administration wanted to dispense with in order to have these programs carried out. One was Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the other was J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI. In due time the indirect attack began on General MacArthur. It began in foreign nations such as in England, where we are spending considerable money under the Marshall plan and the ECA. In England, General MacArthur's services were deemed unsatisfactory. Articles to that effect appeared in dispatches from England to the United States, and culminated in the summary dismissal of General MacArthur.

On December 1, 1950, I made some remarks on the floor about a then newly published book entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation," written by Max Lowenthal. I said, as appears on page 16171 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 1, 1950:

If this attack was an isolated instance, it could be excused as an irresponsible flight of fancy by a nonentity—but it follows too closely the pattern of destruction of responsible Government to be ignored.

I refer the Senate to that statement, which I shall not repeat in full at this time. The attack to which I referred was an attack on Mr. Hoover.

Mr. President, that was not the only attack upon Mr. Hoover. The attack had been made by Charles L. Chute, national vice president of the National Probation and Parole Association, and formerly its executive vice president. He had had a feud going on with the Director of the FBI for many years, as I shall show. Mr. Chute has renewed his attack on the FBI in his organization's official publication entitled "Focus."

A newspaper editorial which appeared in the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin on May 27, 1936, was the first attack. In that editorial the power which was building up in the FBI was deplored. The editorial, though pretending to laud the accomplishments of the FBI, emphasized its cost and deplored the power the FBI had.

Mr. President, in a review of Max Lowenthal's book, which was published by William Sloane Associates, Charles L. Chute very cleverly lauded the FBI to a certain extent, but the sum substance

was in opposition to the power of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The last paragraph of the book review reads as follows:

The book proves beyond doubt that the FBI has built a powerful agency for law enforcement. It has had phenomenal success in its public-relations program. Another and different study is called for to answer the questions as to how its work may become of greater social and constructive value and as to what safeguards—

And I call attention to the emphasis placed by the writer of the review on what safeguards he believes are needed—are needed to avoid the dangers inherent in the arbitrary and unregulated powers it has assumed.

Mr. President, the review leaves the impression that the FBI has assumed powers which Congress did not grant to it. The review is signed by Charles L. Chute.

Earlier I reviewed the attack, or one of the first attacks, on the work of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Judiciary Committee. I hope there would be no further such attacks, but I fear there will be.

It is to be hoped that we do not have further attacks on the FBI; yet I predict that we shall.

Mr. President, it comes down to this: unless the administration can dispense with the services of Mr. Hoover, it will be impossible for them to do to the files of the FBI what it is suspected they have done to the files of the State Department and the Department of Commerce; that is, to strip them of evidence which could be used against members of the State Department and of the Department of Commerce. That evidence, I believe, would prove them to be dangerous to this country as security risks, to say the least, and in some cases it would prove them guilty of traitorous actions.

Mr. President, it was obvious even a year ago that both men, General MacArthur and J. Edgar Hoover, would have to go in order to save the administration. First, General MacArthur would have to go to save their policy, or to consummate their policy in China and in Asia; and, second, Mr. Hoover would have to go in order to save the reputations of many State Department officials and Department of Commerce officials.

It is high time the public begin to connect the instances of attacks upon responsible public men, as in the cases of General MacArthur and Mr. Hoover, Director of the FBI. The former is out, and the junior Senator from Nevada predicts that the attack upon Mr. Hoover will continue, culminating, if it is possible for them to bring about some semblance of a justification, in the dismissal of FBI Director Hoover.

The same thing will take place, if the administration hatchet boys can bring it about, to discredit the subcommittee which is investigating the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws. They just cannot stand being investigated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this short discussion follow the remarks made earlier this afternoon by

the junior Senator from Nevada on the matter of the Subcommittee on Internal Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a few moments ago I was about to ask consent to place in the RECORD a letter from Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, dealing with a statement which was made by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] on last Friday, at which time she called attention to an apparent discrepancy between what appeared in a publication, Democracy at Work, and testimony by Mr. William M. Boyle, Jr., before a Senate committee last week. The book named Mr. Boyle as executive vice chairman during the 1948 campaign. I believe that the Senate should have the facts set forth in the letter from Mr. McGrath by having it appear in the body of the RECORD. Therefore, because of the rule just pronounced by the President of the Senate, I shall read the letter for the information of the Senate. I felt that when the distinguished Senator from Maine made the statement, I should obtain the true facts in regard to the matter. For that reason I called Mr. McGrath, who was chairman of the Democratic National Committee during the 1948 campaign. The following is the letter he wrote to me in response to my telephone request:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
September 15, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR MCFARLAND: The statement made yesterday (September 14) on the floor of the Senate by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH purports to charge William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, with making untrue statements before a subcommittee of the Senate, in that he said that during the 1948 election he held no office in the Democratic Party organization, and that he was merely a volunteer worker. Mrs. SMITH cites a volume, Democracy at Work, which contains the proceedings of the Democratic National Convention of 1948 and additional material wherein a picture of Mr. Boyle appears, entitled "William M. Boyle, Jr., Executive Vice-Chairman, Democratic National Committee."

Senator SMITH was understandably misled by the contents of the book in question. As the chairman of the Democratic National Committee during the period involved, I wish to set forth the accurate record.

William M. Boyle, Jr., came to the Washington headquarters of the party at my request shortly after the nominating convention of the party. He was given no title whatsoever and the work that I asked him to do consisted almost wholly in arranging the President's campaign trips. He received no compensation whatsoever and was in every sense of the word a volunteer, attempting to help the President, with whom he had long been associated. It was not until February 8, 1949, that I asked Mr. Boyle to relieve me of certain responsibilities at the national committee, and to accept, without pay, the position of executive vice chairman. This appointment is attested to by the public announcement made by the National Committee on February 8, 1949, and was carried in the press. I enclose copy herewith.

By April 20, 1949, I determined that my duties in the Senate were such that I would have to be further relieved of the day-to-day,

PROVIDING FOR THE FREE IMPORTATION OF BALER TWINE

OCTOBER 19 (legislative day, OCTOBER 1), 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 1005]

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

This bill would provide for the entry, free of duty, of twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials, which is commonly referred to as baler twine. This would be accomplished by amending paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which paragraph now provides for the entry, free of duty, of binder twine. Under the existing provisions of paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1930, binding twine is admitted free of duty if—manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding 750 feet to the pound.

Under the bill, these restrictions will apply not only to binder twine, but also to baler twine, which is chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Baler twine is now subject to duty at 15 percent ad valorem. It is used principally in automatic pick-up hay balers to tie and bind bales of hay, straw, and fodder crops. It first came into use in 1939, and its use has increased materially since that time due to the steadily increasing use of automatic pick-up twine balers by farmers who find that such baling is efficient and economical. Binder twine, which is

also an agricultural twine, and which is used primarily for binding sheaves of grain and corn, and in some cases hay, has been duty-free since 1896. In many other instances, Congress has exempted from duty commodities and implements used in agricultural pursuits.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals held in the case of *Wilbur-Ellis Co. v. United States* (26 C. C. P. A. 402 (1939)), that the baling of hay is an agricultural pursuit. That case involved the question of the entry of wire-baling ties which were held entitled to entry free of duty under paragraph 1604 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as agricultural implements. Yet, by a ruling of the Commissioner of Customs, on October 15, 1945, holding that baler twine falls within paragraph 1005 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, baler twine used for the same purposes as baling wire is now dutiable at 15 percent ad valorem. This decision of the Commissioner of Customs is still in the process of litigation.

Your committee believes that there is no just basis for distinguishing between the tariff status of such essential commodities of similar use on the farm as binder twine, baling wire, and baler twine. This bill will place baler twine on the same duty-free status as binder twine and baling wire, which is in accord with the established policy of Congress to admit agricultural commodities and implements free of duty.

Witnesses representing farmers and farm organizations appeared before your committee and testified that there is an acute shortage of baler twine. Many reports have been received that, even at the high prices for which baler twine is now selling, it is impossible to obtain sufficient supplies of this twine, which has resulted in losses of hay crops. The representatives of the farm organizations testified that a growing number of farmers are demonstrating a preference for baler twine over baling wire both from the standpoint of greater safety to livestock and greater economy of operation of balers using twine over balers using wire. Although domestic manufacturers of baler twine testified that production in the current year is at a higher rate than in the previous year, they agreed that in many areas of the country farmers have been unable to obtain baler twine in sufficient quantity to meet their needs.

Testimony presented before your committee was in general agreement that imports of baler twine would be increased by providing for duty-free entry. There is no reason to believe that the American farmer would not insist upon as high a standard of quality in the baler twine imported free of duty as he insists upon today in baler twine subject to duty and baler twine produced by domestic manufacturers.

Yet the benefit to the American farmer accorded by this bill, in the judgment of your committee, will result in no substantial adverse effect upon the domestic producers of baler twine. The record of the hearings before your committee affords no basis for concluding that the elimination of the present duty would prevent domestic manufacturers from selling their production of baler twine at a reasonable price.

Nor would there be any adverse effect upon the national security of the United States from the removal of the present tariff on baler twine. Arguments were presented that the stockpiling objectives of the Munitions Board might be endangered on the ground that there

would not be a domestic industry large enough to handle the rotation of the fibers if imports of baler twine were allowed to come in duty-free. It is understood, however, that foreign producers of baler twine have already been asked to share in the rotation of the stockpile maintained in this country.

Accordingly, there seems to be no sound reason for denying the plea of the four major American farm organizations to relieve the American farmer from the penalty of the tariff on baler twine under existing law through passage of H. R. 1005. In their joint testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, the representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Farmers Union, and the National Grange urged that passage of the bill is in the public interest for the following reasons:

First, to carry out a long-established tariff policy of Congress to admit free binding twine.

Second, to increase the supply of baler twine available in this country.

Third, to bring about a more reasonable price.

Fourth, to provide healthy competition in which, we firmly believe, the domestic producer will continue to retain the bulk of a rapidly expanding market.

Fifth, to protect the American food supply.

A favorable report on the bill was received from the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget reported that the bill is in accord with the program of the President.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italics; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

PARAGRAPH 1622 OF SECTION 201 OF TITLE II OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930, AS AMENDED

PAR. 1622. All binding twine, and *twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials*, manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding seven hundred and fifty feet to the pound.



Calendar No. 996

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1005

[Report No. 1050]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 17 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance

OCTOBER 19 (legislative day, OCTOBER 1), 1951

Reported by Mr. GEORGE, without amendment

AN ACT

To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff
4 Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after
5 the words "binding twine" a comma and the words "and
6 twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder
7 and bedding materials,".

8 SEC. 2. The amendment made this Act shall be effec-
9 tive with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from ware-

1 house, for consumption after the date of the enactment of
 2 this Act.

Passed the House of Representatives September 14,
 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

82ND CONGRESS
 1ST SESSION

H. R. 1005

[Report No. 1050]

AN ACT

To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for
 the free importation of twine used for baling
 hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding
 material.

SEPTEMBER 17 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance

OCTOBER 19 (legislative day, OCTOBER 1), 1951

Reported without amendment

Senate

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, under the all-embracing canopy of Thy goodness and mercy which have followed us all the days of our lives, we come as children in our Father's house. Beneath all diversities of gifts and of thought we seek the common unity which binds us together with the cords of Thy brooding love, which will not let us go, and which seeketh us, even in perplexities and pain. Away from all the divisive forces of the world about us, which tear and separate and push apart, we would kneel in penitence at the altar of the one God whose love shed abroad in our hearts alone can send us out on our differing and often difficult paths, hoping all things and enduring all things.

From the valley of futility and despair we lift our eyes to the hills of eternal verities which stab the horizon like great and glorious steeples pointing to the skies, for we know that our help and our hope are in Thee, who hath made heaven and earth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 18, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1311) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 210) authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 4 to the bill (S. 657) to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, with an

amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H. R. 827. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas;

H. R. 1161. An act for the relief of Kenneth McRight;

H. R. 1267. An act to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Okiahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear;

H. R. 1828. An act for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of James Yao;

H. R. 1974. An act for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura;

H. R. 2662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Theima A. Noien;

H. R. 2775. An act for the relief of Anne-liese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath;

H. R. 2833. An act for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of Maude S. Burman;

H. R. 3219. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley;

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H. R. 3600. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of David Yeh;

H. R. 3847. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to school district No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land;

H. R. 3877. An act for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers;

H. R. 3971. An act for the relief of Esther Park;

H. R. 3985. An act for the relief of Hal Soon Lee;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Caroline Wu;

H. R. 4558. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski;

H. R. 4876. An act for the relief of Francesco Frataila;

H. R. 4877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli;

H. R. 5097. An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts

under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost;

H. R. 5730. An act for the relief of William Lund Main; and

H. J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H. R. 827. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas;

H. R. 1161. An act for the relief of Kenneth McRight;

H. R. 1267. An act to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Okiahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear;

H. R. 1828. An act for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of James Yao;

H. R. 1974. An act for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura;

H. R. 2662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen;

H. R. 2775. An act for the relief of Anne-liese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath;

H. R. 2833. An act for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of Maude S. Burman;

H. R. 3219. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley;

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H. R. 3600. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of David Yeh;

H. R. 3971. An act for the relief of Esther Park;

H. R. 3985. An act for the relief of Hal Soon Lee;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Caroline Wu;

H. R. 4558. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski;

H. R. 4876. An act for the relief of Francesco Frataila;

H. R. 4877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli;

H. R. 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost; and

H. J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3347. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a school district No. 23, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land; and

H. R. 5097. An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 19, 1951, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 364. An act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays;

S. 1335. An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; and

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL and by unanimous consent, Mr. BENNETT was granted leave to be absent from the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLLAND was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the record, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. —)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, for the Federal Security Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE WHO SUFFERED LOSSES OF PERSONAL PROPERTY BY REASON OF HOSTILITIES IN KOREA

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States and others, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPAYMENT CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH IRRIGATION DISTRICTS COMPRISING THE OWYHEE FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO-OREGON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the irrigation districts com-

prising the Owyhee Federal reclamation project, Idaho-Oregon, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPAYMENT CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH FRENCHTOWN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MONTANA

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Frenchtown Irrigation District, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPAYMENT CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED WITH MALTA AND GLASGOW IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Malta Irrigation District and the Glasgow Irrigation District, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MUTUAL AID COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF ALABAMA AND FLORIDA

A letter from the Director, Civil Defense Department, State of Alabama, transmitting a copy of the Mutual Aid Compact recently entered into between the States of Alabama and Florida (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION (S. REPT. NO. 1040)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of that committee, together with a report from each agency performing functions under law, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3937. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1042).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2169. A bill authorizing the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of the Gila Pueblo, in Globe County, Ariz., for archaeological laboratory and storage purposes, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1043).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 4288. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 1044).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3838. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1045);

H. R. 3840. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig; without amendment (Rept. No. 1046);

H. R. 4219. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken; without amendment (Rept. No. 1047);

H. R. 4351. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1048); and

H. R. 4352. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1049).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1005. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for bailing hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; without amendment (Rept. No. 1050);

H. R. 2490. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1051);

H. R. 3590. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property; with amendments (Rept. No. 1052); and

H. R. 4948. A bill to suspend certain import duties on lead; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1053).

By Mr. MCLELLAN, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 4055. A bill to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1054).

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1041)

Mr. McMAHON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, submitted, pursuant to Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, a report on the development and control of atomic energy, which was ordered to be printed.

PROGRESS REPORT ON PROBLEMS OF DOMESTIC LAND AND WATER TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER (S. REPT. NO. 1039)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a short statement at this time in regard to the submission to the Senate of a progress report on the domestic land and water transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I have been authorized by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to submit to the Senate a progress report of the Domestic Land and Water Transportation Subcommittee of that group, pursuant to the extensive hearings held during the Eighty-first Congress under the authority of Senate Resolution 50.

I know that public comment on this report, particularly from the transportation industry, will reflect the controversies which now exist in the industry. There are few subjects in this report which could reasonably be called non-controversial. On the other hand, in my judgment, there is no more important work being performed by your Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee than its consideration of these problems in the transportation industry.

I want to emphasize that the report I am offering is only a progress report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. DORA TROOST

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have here a matter to which I draw the attention of the leaders on both sides, and I shall submit a unanimous-consent request.

There has come into my hand House bill 5397, which provides for the renaturalization of a woman who has been away from this country for some time. The purpose of the bill is to restore to Mrs. Dora Troost United States citizenship, notwithstanding any period of residence in a foreign state, provided that she returns to the United States for permanent residence within 1 year following the effective date of the act.

The beneficiary of the bill is a native of Mexico who was naturalized in the United States on November 28, 1945. She has three children who are United States citizens, all of whom are residing in the United States. She has been in the Netherlands West Indies with her husband for over 3 years, and is thereby considered to have lost her United States citizenship, by reason of such residence in a foreign country.

Therefore, Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I report favorably without amendment a bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost, and I submit a report (No. 1056) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what precedent this bill will create? If renaturalization is granted to a woman who has been out of the country for over 3 years, are there other cases which may be similar, and are such cases taken up individually? What is the practice?

Mr. McCARRAN. Every case stands on its own feet and on its own merits. This case would not be presented by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary at this time if, first of all, the facts of the case had not been examined thoroughly by the committee's staff; and, secondly, if we did not believe the case had sufficient merit so that it should be taken up out of the regular course and enacted at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, time is of such essence that the chairman of the committee is taking this unusual course.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection unless the calendar committee has objection.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that we have checked this matter, and the calendar committee has no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO JOSEPH PICKETT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3838) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the word "acres", it is proposed to insert "The prior disposition of the homestead lands of Joseph Pickett is hereby ratified and confirmed."

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, this amendment was suggested by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. For all practical purposes the bill without the amendment would probably clear up the situation. However, in view of the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, I think it would be best to adopt the amendment which he has suggested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What Assistant Secretary suggested the amendment?

Mr. ECTON. It is recommended by Assistant Secretary Dale E. Doty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment was not presented to the committee when the committee had the bill under consideration.

Mr. ECTON. No. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that that was an oversight.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understand, there is no objection on the part of the Interior Department to the amendment.

Mr. ECTON. The Interior Department recommends the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO LAURA A. CRAIG

The bill (H. R. 3840) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO LOUIS W. MILLIKIN

The bill (H. R. 4219) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Millikin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO URSULA RUTHERFORD OLLINGER

The bill (H. R. 4351) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO MARY RUTHERFORD SPEARSON

The bill (H. R. 4352) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 3937) to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061) to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SABINE RIVER COMPACT BETWEEN TEXAS AND LOUISIANA

The bill (H. R. 4288) granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACQUISITION OF GILA PUEBLO, ARIZONA, BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The bill (S. 2169) authorizing the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of the Gila Pueblo in Globe County, Ariz., for archeological laboratory and storage purposes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will withhold my objection for a moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this bill involves some property near Globe, Ariz., known as the Gila Pueblo, which consists of several buildings in excellent condition. The buildings were erected by a private individual for archaeological purposes. They cost many times the price for which the Government can now obtain them. These buildings would constitute a fine monument for the Government. The property is valuable. I hope the Senator will not object to the Government having the advantage of this property at the price stipulated. I cannot see why there should be any objection to the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I presume there is some merit in the request of the Senator from Arizona. However, the Senator from Arizona knows that the larger portion of the area of Arizona is in the hands of the Federal Government. All this bill would do would be to add more land to the holdings of the Government, land which is possibly now

on the tax rolls of Arizona. If it were transferred to the Federal Government it would be taken off the tax rolls. For that reason I do not see why the bill should pass by unanimous consent on the call of the calendar. I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further withhold his objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. No one depreciates the idea of the Federal Government taking over private land holdings any more than does the junior Senator from Arizona, and particularly in Arizona where it already is the largest land owner. However, this property is of particular value to the State. Because of the archaeological history involved and the work which has been done in the past making this a noteworthy monument it is believed that this property will be more valuable to the State if it is placed in the hands of the Federal Government than it would be if it were to remain in private ownership. Of course, if we have to take the bill up in the regular order, we can do so, but the property will deteriorate that much more in the meantime.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say one further word. Once upon a time the State of New Mexico owned the Carlsbad National Monument. It was the property of the State of New Mexico. Foolishly we passed a bill similar to the bill which is now under discussion, and we have been sorry ever since. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The Clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN KINDS OF TWINE

The bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions with regard to the bill. As I understand, the bill would permit free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material. My interest in it is that in Massachusetts there is located one of the largest factories for making twine in the country, the Plymouth Cordage Company. Other cordage companies are also interested.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia this question: Is not the definition of twine given in the bill very indefinite? I ask the question because I feel that there should be some protection given not only to the American manufacturer, who wants to be protected from the importation of cheaper grades of twine than the type he manufactures, but also to the American farmer, so that he may buy imported twine, if he so desires, which would work in his combine, and not fail him.

I know that in the committee an amendment was offered to define twine; and I should like to read to the Senator from Georgia that definition, with the thought that possibly he could give me an idea as to whether it represents his interpretation of what the bill means. The definition is:

All binding twine and baler twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply, measuring not exceeding 750 feet to the pound containing not less than 8 percent of oil by weight, treated to repel insects and rodents, and in the case of baler twine to resist mildew, and chiefly used in harvesting agricultural crops.

It is my understanding that if that definition of what it meant by baler twine were included it would be a very proper bill, because it would keep up the grade of the twine which would come into this country and be of value not only to the farmer but to the manufacturer also.

I would appreciate it very much if the chairman of the Committee on Finance would state whether the definition which I have read represents his understanding of what is meant by the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. A portion of that definition, of course, is provided in the law, and I call attention to paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1932. It reads as follows:

All binding twine—

That is the present law; the bill adds—and twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials—

That is the only language added; then follows the remainder of section 1622—manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding 750 feet to the pound.

Thus far the definition is prescribed by law. With reference to the oil content of the baler twine, I must frankly say that I do not know, except that from the actual use of the baler twine I should think that if it had no oil it would be a very inferior type of twine, and could not be easily used in the modern reaper, binder, combine, or other machines in which such twine is used.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know what the oil content should be under any proper definition.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. THYE. The oil is the result of a treating process designed to keep insects away from the twine. If twine were not treated crickets would cut it the very first night it was put in the bundle or bale. Oil is used as a treating process to protect the twine from insects. The act has protected the producer and the user of the twine, so far as binding a bundle or bale is concerned. What is being done today is to keep pace with progress in America, because the harvester has been replaced by the combine. In order to salvage the straw, the baler goes into the field and picks up the straw

and bales it. It is a part of the revolution in agriculture. That was the only reason why producer and farm organizations have asked for the same consideration for baler twine as was extended to the binder twine in earlier years.

A bale can be bound with either wire or twine. Some farmers prefer twine, while others prefer wire. With this duty on the twine, of course, the cost of binding a bale is higher. Therefore, they have asked that the duty be waived.

Mr. GEORGE. I would think that in general the definition which was read by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would be the definition the customs officials would adopt. I am speaking generally, because I have no very definite knowledge about how the twine is treated and what the oil content is. I agree entirely with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that twine must have oil treatment in order to make it usable and in order to preserve it against rodents and insects.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the purposes stated by the Senator from Minnesota. I use baler twine myself on my little place in Massachusetts. What I should like to emphasize as best I can is this: Do not the words "chiefly used for baling hay," and so forth, let down the whole restrictive content of paragraph 1622? I may say that when baler twine came in it would come in as a very inferior grade, if it were argued that it would be chiefly used for baling hay. That is what I should like to have the RECORD show.

Mr. GEORGE. I would say that the section is rather vague, but I believe the customs officials can be relied upon to define it in a way that would substantially agree with the definition which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has suggested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If that be true, I do not believe that the citizens of Massachusetts who are interested in this subject would have any great objection. Is it not true that a lawsuit will have to be brought or an interpretation made by Customs Court in order to get a regulation interpreting the provision?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that is correct. I think the Department will have to work out an interpretive regulation, which will probably be passed upon by the Customs Court. That was true in the case of binding twine when we put it into the Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the feeling of the Senator from Georgia that such a ruling by the Customs Court should in substance carry out the definition I read and which the Senator feels is proper?

Mr. GEORGE. I think so. I should say so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Under those circumstances I will not submit the definition I have read as an amendment to the bill, because we can get the same result

by a Customs Court interpretation and a regulation based thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator very much. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a telegram which I received this morning from the American Farm Bureau Federation, National Farmers' Union, Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 20, 1951.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,

United States Senate:

Any proposed rider amendments to H. R. 1005 of unrelated nature are a threat to enactment of this vital legislation at this session of Congress. We hope you will oppose such moves and give the American farmer prompt relief in the supply of baler twine which is important in food production.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION.
COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES.
NATIONAL GRANGE.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may correct a misstatement of mine?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I said that my Massachusetts constituents would not object. Of course, they object to the bill, but, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Georgia, the bill is improved considerably.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I should like to assure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that in connection with the consideration of the House bill, there was considerable discussion along the line of the amendment, or definition, or description the Senator from Massachusetts has just read. For his information, I may say that the four farm organizations whose telegrams were just placed in the RECORD, in connection with their endorsement of this measure, and the representatives of the Cordage Institute, as I understood, were practically in agreement on the definition the Senator read into the RECORD a few moments ago.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska, because I know he is interested in this matter, and I know he wants to have the best possible ball of twine made available, as does the Senator from Minnesota. So I hope the regulation will be interpreted in the proper way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1005) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for

equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes;

S. 1931. An act for the relief of Joyce Jacquelyn Johnson;

S. 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschles);

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo; and

S. 2228. An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5334) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 26, 28, 32, 37, 40, 48, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 93, and 101 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 14, 27, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 73, 87, 105, and 110, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3889. An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5593. An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5329. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 5411. An act to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense-housing areas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4749. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La.; and

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution providing that the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 8, 1952.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 170) providing for the printing of 35,500 additional copies of the public law enacted during the Eighty-second Congress, first session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1951," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4749) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REVENUE ACT OF 1951

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 170, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 35,500 additional copies of the public law enacted during the Eighty-second Congress, first session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1951," of which 3,000 copies shall be for the Senate Document Room, 30,000 copies for the House Document Room, 1,000 copies for the Senate Committee on Finance, and 1,500 copies for the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS—DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Richard M. Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security; and I request the immediate consideration of the nomination. Mr. Bissell is to be next in authority to Mr. Harriman. We could not bring forward Mr. Bissell's nomination until Mr. Harriman's nomination had been confirmed. Therefore, I should like to have Mr. Bissell's nomination confirmed at this time, because the nomination is a very important one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none.

The question is, as in executive session, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I happen to know Mr. Bissell because he comes from Massachusetts. He has been Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and more recently he has served as Acting Administrator of the ECA. He is well qualified for the new position to which he has been nominated. The confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Harriman as Director for Mutual Security makes it important that the nomination of Mr. Bissell to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security be confirmed before the end of this session. I know of no objection to the nomination, and I see no reason why the nomination should not be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection, the President will be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, now that we are proceeding as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the one nomination on the Executive Calendar be considered at this time, as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph Charles Duggan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF NARCOTICS LAWS

The bill (H. R. 3490) to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotics laws, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none; and, without objection—

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I think it would be unfortunate to have this bill passed without having a brief comment made.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for and the benefits to be derived from more stringent legislation to curb the widespread traffic in narcotic drugs.

The recent Nation-wide indignation, which directly stems from investigations and hearings by the Senate Crime Committee, indicates the gravity of the problem.

When the Senate extended the life of our committee, and I was designated chairman, we made this problem our No. 1 assignment. Unfortunately, before that, only scant attention had been given this curse; and in those instances the activity was confined to a single locality. Our investigation was launched on a

Nation-wide basis, and the revelations and disclosures were such that we concluded it was imperative that drastic action be taken.

Our Senate committee came to the conclusion that, first, the illicit traffic in narcotics constitutes an evil of such great proportions that, unless curbed, it will endanger the social structure of the United States and inflict irreparable harm to the youth of the Nation.

Second, the increase in the use by younger people of drugs has been shocking. Not only do the records of hospitals reveal this, but information gathered by the committee points unmistakably to the upward trend in this narcotic addiction.

Third, because the traffic in narcotic drugs pays huge profits to the most depraved of the criminal elements, the peddlers are ready to wreck the lives of children in order to obtain the enormous income.

Fourth, penalties for violations must be increased. Short sentences do not act as a deterrent to the professional peddlers, and suspended sentences defeat the very purposes of the laws.

Our committee held hearings at the United States Public Health Service hospital at Lexington, Ky., and secured first-hand information as to the extent of this problem and the terrible results of addiction. Later we held public hearings, and the information that was disclosed proved conclusively that this problem is a challenging one. Unfortunately, some of the Federal courts in the past have not faced this situation realistically, and, as a result, short sentences have been imposed. The professional drug peddler responsible for the widespread use has been able to return to his illicit trade all too soon.

Our experience in the survey of criminal activities showed clearly that lengthy sentences imposed promptly after conviction of criminal offenses have a very salutary effect. The history of other instances of drastic legislation, both at the Federal level and at the State level, leaves no doubt that criminals are aware of this situation. Consequently, our committee took the lead in urging the enactment of legislation for lengthy sentences for this type of offense. I, as chairman of the committee which projected this Nation-wide effort, express the hope that this proposed legislation will be enacted and made effective forthwith, inasmuch as offenses of this type require lengthy prison sentences, in accordance with the provisions of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3490) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me, to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with the passage of House bill 3490, Calendar No. 997, a bill amending the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotics laws, a brief statement, together with excerpts from the testimony of Dr. Anslinger, as to the great importance of that measure.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This bill (H. R. 3490) which is the same as the Senate bill 1695 filed by me and sponsored by Senators O'CONOR, HUNT, TOBEY, and WILEY, the members of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, is one of the most important proposals made in this session of Congress. Its enactment will put into effect recommendation No. 12 of the Senate Crime Committee as set forth in the third interim report. It sets up mandatory penalties for persons convicted of narcotic selling and other violations. Sentences after the first one cannot be suspended.

I shall not discuss the lives and homes wrecked by narcotic violators. It is one of the Nation's foremost problems. Mr. Anslinger, the very capable head of the Federal Narcotics Bureau is doing an excellent job with the staff furnished him and with the weak laws now on the statute books. He feels and the Crime Committee feel that this mandatory-penalty law was the one most needed piece of legislation in the effort against the narcotic peddlers.

The Senate Crime Committee in its third interim report has this to say as to the need for this legislation:

"XII. THE PENALTIES AGAINST THE ILLEGAL SALE, DISTRIBUTION, AND SMUGGLING OF NARCOTIC DRUGS SHOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED"

"We have seen that there has been a serious increase in the narcotics traffic, particularly among teen-agers: One of the ways to curb that traffic is through the imposition of severe penalties. Mr. Harry Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, testified before this committee that—

"The average prison sentence meted out in the Federal courts is 18 months. Short sentences do not deter. In districts where we get good sentences the traffic does not flourish. * * * Both the League of Nations and the United Nations have recommended more severe sentences as one of the best methods to suppress the traffic.

"In many countries that has been very effective.

* * * * *

"There should be a minimum sentence for the second offense. The commercialized transaction, the peddler, the smuggler, those who traffic in narcotics, on the second offense if there were a minimum sentence of 5 years without probation or parole, I think it would just about dry up the traffic."

"In the light of this testimony, Congress should pass legislation to provide for increased penalties for drug peddlers and others engaged in the commercialized aspects of the drug traffic. Mandatory penalties of imprisonment of at least 5 years should be provided for second offenders. Such legislation is now pending in the House of Representatives where it is receiving the careful consideration of the Committee on Ways and Means."

Following this report S. 1695 was filed by the junior Senator from Tennessee on June 18. Meantime Congressman Boggs had filed and was pushing for passage of this legislation in the House of Representatives. Congressman Boggs, Senator GEORGE and their associates on the Ways and Means and Fi-

Public Law 219 - 82d Congress
Chapter 587 - 1st Session
H. R. 1005

AN ACT

All 65 Stat. 655.

To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 2 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "binding twine" a comma and the words "and twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials,". 46 Stat. 675. 19 U.S.C. § 1201, par. 1622.

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act. Effective date.

Approved October 25, 1951.

